DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 413 UD 016 679

AUTHOR	Crocker, Stephen; And Others
TITLE	Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Review of Program Operations.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	RC-R-1901/2-HEW
PUB DATE	Aug 76
CONTRACT	OEC-0-74-9262
NOTE	166p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Role; Federal Programs; Government Role; Integration Studies; Negro Education; *Program Coordination; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; *Racial Integration; *School Integration; State Agencies; *Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Civil Rights Act 1964 Title IV

ABSTRACT

This descriptive and evaluative report documents four Title IV-funded agencies that deal with racial desegregation services: specifically, the General Assistance Centers, the State Educational Agencies, the Training Institutes, and the Local Education Agencies. The study is based on a statistical analysis of responses to mail questionnaires from 140 Title IV projects, from site visits to school districts served by projects, and from interview data. The report reviews program operations in terms of regulations and specific limitations on Title IV assistance. The operation of each project type, the role of the regional office, and the role of the federal government are described. The major strength of these programs is that they provide assistance to school districts in varying stages of desegregation. Their major weakness is that their lack of specificity dilutes the benefits, both for districts receiving services and for the agencies delivering them. Recommendations for program improvements are made. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133413

TITLE IV OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964: A REVIEW OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS

PREPARED FOR THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

STEPHEN CROCKER, ROBERT L. CRAIN,
MORLIE H. GRAUBARD, JACKIE M. KIMBROUGH,
NICKI J. KING, MARGARET A. THOMAS,
FREDERICK M. WIRT, WITH THE
ASSISTANCE OF LONNA P. OLIVER

R-1901/2-HEW
AUGUST 1976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Rand
SANTA MONICA, CA. 90406

UD016679

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. OEC-O-74-9262 with the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Views or conclusions contained in this study should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Published by The Rand Corporation

PREFACE

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) to provide technical assistance and training services to school districts for the purpose of meeting special needs associated with implementing a school desegregation plan or with operating a desegregated school system. This assistance is provided through direct financial aid to school districts themselves (direct-funded Local Education Agencies) as well as indirect assistance made possible through grants and contracts with service organizations that assist school districts. The organizations include the General Assistance Center, State Education Agency, and Training Institute. This is the final report of Rand's evaluation of Title IV operations, conducted at the request of the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Education (OPBE) of the U.S. Office of Education under Contract No. OEC-0-74-9262. This report is addressed primarily to OPBE, Title IV program personnel, and school district personnel associated with Title IV projects.

The study pursues two broad purposes defined for it by USOE. The first is to describe the current service delivery system under Title IV. The second is to evaluate current operations to assist federal officials in improving program functions. This report is intended to increase understanding of Title IV operations and is oriented to the needs of federal officials.

The report comprises two volumes. Volume I, the *Executive Summary*, highlights the major findings and recommendations but does not include a detailed discussion of theory, methodology, or data analysis. Volume II, the *Review of Program Operations*, covers these areas and provides additional findings and recommendations.

PUBLICATIONS
DEPARTMENT

ERRATA

R-1901/2-HEW. Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Review of Program Operations, S. Crocker, et al.. August 1976.

Please change line 23, p. 118, to read as follows:

"appear in Table 40a. The prediction table indicates that introducing"

and include the following table at that place.

Table 40a

PREDICTED AND ACTUAL EFFECTS OF CONTROLLING CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PROJECT OFFICE CHARACTERISTICS AND DISTRICT IMPACT BY AMENABILITY TO DESEGREGATION MOVEMENT

Project Type Before and After Control		Organized Planning Function	Organization Management	Staff Capability	Project Office Organization
Predicted Level					
Before control:	GAC	++	++	++	++
	TI	+	+	+	+
After control:	GAC	++	++	++	++
	TI	0	0	0	0
Actual Level					
Before control:	GAC	.732[a]	.711[a]	.595[a]	.663[a]
	TI	.354	.234	.389	.357
After control	GAC	.728[a]	.680[a]	.487[a]	.628[a]
	TI	.199	.079	.130	.224

[a] T_b significant at .001.

Rand
SANTA MONICA, CA. 90406

SUMMARY

This report describes and evaluates current operations of agencies funded under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It proposes both specific changes in program regulations and a more general review of the federal oversight function.

Title IV provides technical assistance and training services to school districts in various stages of desegregation both through direct grants and through indirect assistance provided by service agencies funded specifically under Title IV. The General Assistance Center (GAC) and State Education Agency (SEA) are empowered under Section 403 of Title IV to provide both technical assistance and training services to school districts requesting such assistance. Section 404 provides for the establishment of the Training Institute (TI) for purposes of offering desegregation-related training services to requesting school districts. Section 405 provides for direct funding of school districts (direct-funded Local Education Agencies--dfLEAs) to hire a desegregation specialist and, in some cases, provides for desegregation-related in-service training.

This study of Title IV operations is based primarily on an analysis of mail questionnaires from 140 project offices (GACs, SEAs, TIs, and dfLEAs), and interviewer ratings from on-site interviews at 40 project offices and 74 client school districts. Examples from the field work supplement the analysis of questionnaire data to provide more detail in description. Also, interviews were conducted at seven of the ten regional offices responsible for administering the Title IV program, and with personnel in the Equal Educational Opportunity Programs (EEOP) division of USOE (the federal supervisory agency) in Washington, D.C.; these interviews provide the basis for examining the federal role in the Title IV program.

Initially, the report reviews program operations in terms of regulations, and the current literature about change agent strategies for providing services to school districts helps specify the limitations on Title IV assistance (Sec. II). The regulations imply an awareness by

EEOP personnel of the necessity for multiple-level entry points into a school system if change is to be promoted. Some authorities in implementation strategy favor a "top-down" approach, where services are focused on persons with formal authority (such as district superintendents). These strategists assert that change can succeed in a school district only if it begins at the top and percolates down. Other authorities favor directing services to the instructional perimeter of the system (that is, to teachers and counselors). As a result, since instructional personnel actually implement district policy, those change effects would eventually ripple into the administrative core of the district. Title IV regulations allow for assistance to be directed to both levels of school district personnel: The GAC is understood by the United States Office of Education to target both the administrative core and instructional perimeter; the SEA the administrative core; and the TI the instructional perimeter. In this manner Title IV can be regarded as a program with multiple targets; it does not subscribe to a single approach to promoting change in school districts.

In Secs. III through VIII, the report describes the operation of each Title IV project type, the role of the regional office, and the federal oversight function.

Section III describes the GAC, which provides a broader range of services (both technical assistance and training) to a greater number of districts than other Title IV agencies. These centers tend to work with the total school system to promote change; they plan and direct their activities to more levels of district personnel than other project types. As a result of this broader base and their greater variety of services, we believe that GACs have the greatest direct potential for effecting change at the school district level.

General Assistance Centers provide a variety of complex services to different levels of personnel within a number of school districts that may be geographically scattered, which makes both the GAC's organizational characteristics and its methods of interacting with district personnel critical variables in determining whether it has an impact on the districts it serves. Organizational characteristics of the more

effective GACs include:

1. A specific plan of how the GAC will serve all of its client school districts.
2. A long-range plan for providing change-oriented desegregation assistance rather than simply reacting to requests for service.
3. Specific milestones and goals for school districts in the assistance process.
4. A clear description of GAC staff responsibilities.
5. Prescribed feedback by staff and school districts.
6. Specific staffing requirements.
7. An ability to implement their activities and to adhere to their schedules as planned.

Methods of interacting with school districts that characterize more effective GACs include:

1. Specific methods for gaining access to influential school district officials.
2. Open access by GAC staff to the superintendent and central office staff in school districts assisted.
3. A high degree of familiarity with the communities served (schools, community groups, school board members, and other public officials).

General Assistance Centers that are more active in conducting needs assessment tend to undertake desegregation-related activities more often. They also tend to operate somewhat autonomously from their host institution (the university or college in which they are located), but when they do not, the result is likely to be less emphasis on desegregation-related activities.

Section IV describes the SEAs. These agencies tend to focus on technical assistance activities, and their pattern of interaction with school districts reflects the same top-down method of operations. State Education Agencies report more implementation problems than other project

types, which constrain the types of assistance SEAs can deliver. Support by other state personnel in carrying out its program is correlated with SEAs' undertaking desegregation-related activities more often. Yet, SEA directors report the lowest levels of support of any project type from their host institution, which implies that SEA directors are in general not receiving enough support to undertake desegregation activities more often. This result was substantiated by our field work; two out of the thirteen SEAs visited had made an operational commitment to desegregation, and those were judged by our interviewers as the most effective Title IV SEAs no matter which measure of effectiveness was used. Finally, SEAs generally were rated by our interviewers as most effective in the area of minority recruitment and seem to be the logical agency to coordinate this Title IV effort, since they interacted with the same districts more often than other project types.

Training Institutes, as discussed in Sec. V, show more specialization than other Title IV projects, emphasizing activities relating to the training of school personnel. This training emphasis may be replaced by technical assistance when a TI is funded for longer periods of time. Institutes plan with their client district's administrative personnel to build support for their activities, but target their activities to the instructional areas of the system more than other project types. Essentially, the TIs structure themselves to meet specific district needs. As a result the TI often operates as an in-service arm of the school districts it serves. Delays in funding are more serious for TIs than for other project types, because institutes are usually conducted in the summer shortly after the time awards are made. Developing consistent follow-up procedures by institutes would help enable participants to act as trainers when they returned to their own school districts.

Section VI describes the dfLEA, which represents a direct grant to school districts to provide assistance in desegregation. The activities of dfLEAs vary according to the stage of desegregation that the district is in; although almost all dfLEAs use their grants to hire desegregation specialists, Title IV funds may be used to supplement compensatory education activities and to augment Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) services once districts have completed implementation of their desegregation plan.

The key to the influence of the dfLEA advisory specialist appears to be the commitment of the superintendent and district personnel to desegregation. Our site visits indicated that the most effective advisory specialists were located in districts where superintendents were committed and were used in a staff role to supplement the role of the superintendent by being active in areas in which the superintendent does not usually get involved--building community support for desegregation and working with students.

Section VII describes the role of the regional office in the administration of Title IV. Regional office responsibilities in implementing Title IV are not clearly defined, either procedurally or in terms of program content. There is no formal charge to the regional offices and there is no consistent understanding by the regional offices of their responsibilities in implementing Title IV Regulations and Guidelines. Regional office personnel are perceived by Title IV Project Directors as providing helpful assistance more in the area of administrative rulings than program content.

In addition, there are a number of inconsistent forms and procedures, both in monitoring and panel review of proposals, which could be standardized. These include monitoring forms, panel review selection procedures, criteria for selecting panelists, methods of training panelists, and the manner in which proposals are batched and sent to panels for review. Proposals are presently reviewed without input from the Program Officer, who is the person with the most knowledge of ongoing projects. Proposals are ranked nationally although they are scored regionally, and it appears that this process tempts panelists to give higher scores than the projects always warrant.

Section VIII examines the larger context of Title IV operations, focusing more attention on the federal role.

The program recommendations in Sec. IX build from the previous analyses of project types, regional office structure, and federal superstructure to synthesize a set of specific changes in the Regulations and Guidelines. The major recommendations for Title IV projects include: targeting dfLEA grants and limiting TI clients to districts with amenable desegregation environments; narrowing the scope of SEA activities

to information dissemination, unless state commitment to desegregation is high; and adding measures of effective organizational characteristics to the criteria for awarding GAC contracts. Major recommendations on regional office operations include the standardization of procedures and forms for monitoring the proposal review process and the selection of panelists. Finally it is suggested that the EEOP provide a more explicit federal mission to the program and establish a much closer link between regional office and Washington personnel.

The major strength of the present Title IV program is that it permits assistance to school districts in varying stages of desegregation. The major weakness is that the program's lack of specificity dilutes the benefits of such assistance most of the time, both for districts receiving services and for the service agencies delivering them. Targeting assistance and specifying agency responsibilities could help bring the program closer to its potential.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to the many people who made valuable contributions to this report. In particular, we would like to thank our colleagues Ellen Boissevain, Frances Carter, Paul Jordan, Joan Ratteray, Marta Samulon, and Gerald Sumner for assisting with the field interviewing. In addition, Marta Samulon spent many hours scheduling appointments and making arrangements for our site visits.

Phyllis Ellickson and Milbrey McLaughlin served as our reviewers, and their critical comments on both volumes of this report have improved them immeasurably.

Also, we wish to thank the members of our advisory committee, whose practical knowledge of school district and Title IV program operations provided us with invaluable insights.

Finally, we appreciate the guidance of Robert York, who served as the technical monitor of this study, and we gratefully acknowledge other personnel at the U.S. Office of Education and in the Title IV project offices and client school districts for cheerfully responding to our many questions.

Although this study would not have been possible without the assistance and cooperation of many people, responsibility for any errors rests with the authors.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

SUMMARY v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xi

Section

I. INTRODUCTION 1
The Methodology of the Study 2
An Appraisal of the Methodology Used for This Type of Evaluation 7

II. TITLE IV OPERATIONS ACCORDING TO REGULATIONS, GUIDELINES, AND STRATEGIES OF INTERVENTION 13
Program Regulations and Guidelines 13
The Intervention Process: How Title IV Functions as a Change Agent Program 21
Strategies of Intervention 25
Summary 30

III. GENERAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS 32
Project Office Characteristics 32
GAC Interactions with Other Title IV Agencies, Levels of Government, and the Local School District 46
Summary 51

IV. STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES 52
Project Office Characteristics 52
Implementation Problems 54
SEA Interactions with Other Title IV Agents, Levels of Government, and the Local School District 58
Summary 66

V. TRAINING INSTITUTES 68
Project Office Characteristics 68
Summary 77

VI. DIRECT-FUNDED LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES 79
Project Office Characteristics 80
Comparison of dfLEA Interactions with Other Title IV Units and District Personnel 89
Summary 93

VII. THE REGIONAL OFFICE 94
Administrative Structure and Operations 95
Field Operations 98
Proposal Review 101
Summary 103

VIII. THE CONTEXT OF TITLE IV OPERATIONS: AN OVERVIEW 105
The Local-Level Context of Title IV Assistance 105
The Professional Context of Assistance: Title IV and the Politics of American Education 107
Title IV Assistance as Viewed from the Federal Level 109
The Operation of Title IV Under Political Constraints 111
Summary 113

IX. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS 114
Recommendations Based on an Analysis of the Desegregation Environment of Client School Districts Receiving Title IV Assistance 114
Recommendations Based on an Analysis of District Interaction Patterns 122
Recommendations Based on an Analysis of the Relationship Between a Title IV Project and Its Host Institution .. 124
The Regional Office 126
Administrative Structure and Staff Characteristics 127
Proposal Review 129
Concluding Remarks 133

Appendix
A. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENTS 135
B. SAMPLING PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING TITLE IV PROJECTS AND CLIENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS 138
C. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEWER RATING SHEETS 146

BIBLIOGRAPHY 151

I. INTRODUCTION

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides funds to school districts, state departments of education, universities, and nonprofit research organizations to pay for technical assistance to school districts undergoing racial desegregation. This is the report of Rand's evaluation on the operation of Title IV, conducted at the request of the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation (OPBE) of the U.S. Office of Education (USOE). Perhaps because of the small size of the Title IV program (in FY74 its appropriation was $21.7 million) it has received little national attention. This is the first HEW-sponsored evaluation of Title IV. Internal evaluations have been done to a limited degree by Equal Educational Opportunity Programs (EEOPs) in the Office of Education, which operates the program, and in 1973 the United States Commission on Civil Rights published a report based on a study of the program conducted during the previous two years. The reader may find it helpful to read their report in conjunction with this one.* Although the scope and methodologies of the two studies differ markedly, they address some of the same issues.

We can summarize the intent of this evaluation in a sentence: It is formative, descriptive, designed to increase understanding of Title IV program operations, and oriented to the needs of federal administrators.

The evaluation attempts to describe the range of activities and operation styles undertaken in a very diversified program. Title IV funds have been used to organize parent groups, to teach elementary school teachers new reading techniques, and to assist in drawing up desegregation plans--to mention just a few of the services it sponsors. Depending on the definition of "service," one might conclude that Title IV services have been provided in as many as 4000 school districts. Since Title IV aid is usually used in conjunction with other federal,

---

*U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Title IV and School Desegregation: A Study of a Neglected Federal Program*, January 1973.

state, or local funding, it is probably not possible to measure the success with which these districts have met desegregation-related needs and to statistically isolate the role of Title IV. Consequently, we have chosen instead to concentrate on a description of the program and to develop an understanding of its strengths and weaknesses. Finally, we make some recommendations for policymakers on what can be done to improve the operation of the program.

Very little is known about Title IV, and there are few similar programs from which we might take lessons. Technical assistance to school districts is not a common strategy for encouraging change in education. Our lack of understanding of technical assistance in education, coupled with the breadth of the program, demanded an evaluation diffuse enough to deal with a number of unanticipated issues. While no evaluation can do everything, it made sense to cast the widest possible net. Finally, the evaluation was conducted realizing that although Congress and the USOE fund Title IV projects, their controls on them are very indirect. The focus of the recommendations is thus upon the portion of the program to which federal policy applies.

THE METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The methodology of this evaluation combines the statistical analysis of responses to mail questionnaires from 140 project offices with a set of 40 case studies based upon site visits to Title IV projects and to the school districts that are their clients. This methodology was designed to balance the advantages and disadvantages of "hard" statistical analysis and "soft" case study data.

The case study, in which a trained observer conducts an in-depth examination of a single case, permits the researcher to discover unanticipated facts, to develop new ideas as he or she learns, and to pursue those ideas with new data collection. This process permits the theorist and the data to interact continuously and is especially useful when the respondents often are themselves trained social scientists who can contribute to this process directly. The disadvantage of the case study method is that although the data may be highly valid in the sense that they provide more accurate information in an interactive social setting,

they may not be reliable in the sense that two observers in the same community might reach different conclusions about matters of supposed fact. Another problem is not so much that the researcher permits his bias to enter the analysis but that the bias enters in ways that are not easily observed by the reader.

Traditionally, the worst problem with political case studies is that they have been made as single cases, leaving the reader to decide whether the case selected was indeed typical of the universe in which he is interested. In the past few years, this problem has been overcome through the use of comparative case studies, where groups of researchers simultaneously conduct case studies in a statistically random sample. While this approach is relatively new in academic social science, it has been common in program evaluation. Within the academic community, the best known set of comparative case studies is the human relations area files, which have been coded to permit statistical comparisons of large numbers of societies. Coding of existing case studies to permit secondary statistical analysis of case studies done by different researchers at different times is a technique called the "case survey" method.*

In many ways the survey methodology is the extreme opposite of the case study. The survey gathers data that may be more reliable and whose biases are visible, at least to the trained researcher. It can deal with very large numbers of respondents and permits sophisticated multivariate analysis. The difficulty is that the conversion of a complex bit of reality into a series of questionnaire responses may produce responses that are reliable in the sense that they can be duplicated by other researchers with the same result, but they may not be valid, since they may not actually measure what they purport to measure. The other and often more serious difficulty with the survey method is that it locks the researcher into a pattern of collecting all data first and doing the analysis second; it limits the researcher's ability to discover unanticipated findings and forces the reality that its measures are oversimplified

*See, for example, William A. Lucas, *The Case Survey Method: Aggregating Case Experience*, The Rand Corporation, R-1515-RC, October 1974.

to fit the conceptual frame that the researcher held at the beginning of the study. Researchers have attempted to compromise by combining both the case study and the survey in their research.

This evaluation combines case study field work and survey statistical methods. The methodology has five components:

1. A questionnaire mailed to Project Directors and staff of all Title IV projects.
2. A specified sampling procedure for selecting projects and project clients for the field work.
3. Site visits to all four types of Title IV projects and project clients.
4. The use of group debriefings after site visits.
5. Coding of site visit data to permit computerized analysis.

Mail questionnaires were sent to all Project Directors and to a sample of project staff. The project staff was sampled by providing the Project Director with a random number selector, which he used to determine which two staff members would receive questionnaires. There are 164 Title IV projects operating in FY75. The return rate,* by project types, is as follows:

MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN RATES

Project Types[a]	Number Eligible	Number Returned	Return Rate (%)
GAC	26	24	92
SEA	39	36	92
TI	47	41	87
dfLEA	52	39	75
Total	164	140	84

[a]GAC = General Assistance Center; SEA = State Education Agency; TI = Teaching Institute; dfLEA = direct-funded Local Education Agency.

*These return rates are much higher than normally expected because of the cooperation of Title IV personnel in all phases of this

The mail questionnaire asked for a description of the staff--its size and the background and experience of each member. It asks for a description of the way in which the project contacts and works with client districts, the types of activities it undertakes, the problems it has experienced, the nature of its relationship with the regional office, its experience with funding, and its use of internal evaluation. The mail questionnaire closes by asking each respondent to point out what they see as the strength and weakness of present Title IV operations. A brief description of the content appears in Appendix A.

All mail questionnaires, as well as on-site instruments, were thoroughly pretested with the assistance of Title IV personnel. Their assistance enabled our questionnaires to be both more accurate and relevant to Title IV operations, another condition that we believe important in promoting higher completion rates.

Sampling to select projects for site visits was done with three considerations in mind: First, GACs and SEAs were oversampled, since they accounted for a larger fraction of Title IV funds. Second, the sample was drawn so as to represent as many regions as possible, particularly to guarantee selection of Title IV projects in areas where bilingualism is an important consideration. Third, projects were clustered so that we could observe interaction between different types of Title IV projects servicing the same areas. The final sample consisted of 13 SEAs, 12 GACs, 6 TIs, and 9 dfLEAs under the jurisdiction of seven regional offices of USOE. In nine of the states three or four project types (the SEA and GAC, and either a TI or a dfLEA, or both) were visited. In four states two project types were visited (a SEA and a GAC in three cases, a SEA and a dfLEA in the fourth).

Before the site visit, sampled projects were contacted and asked to provide a list of their client school districts. Clients were randomly

---

evaluation. This cooperation enabled us to send out all questionnaires with a cover letter signed by the EEOP bureau chiefs in charge of the Title IV program. We believe this is probably the single most important component in obtaining such high return rates.

sampled from this list, with the proviso that clients within 100 miles of the project office be selected where possible, and the sampling was stratified to provide an equal number of rural and urban districts. Three clients were visited for each GAC, two clients for each SEA and TI. This totaled 74 school districts. The specific procedures for sample selection are described more fully in Appendix B.

Site visits were conducted by teams of usually three staff members who spent one week in each state. Typically, three persons together spent one day at each GAC and one of those three then spent three additional days visiting three client school districts of the center. Normally, two persons spent a day at each SEA with one visiting two clients of the state over the next two days. Training Institute visits took two to three days, one in the project office and one or two visiting its clients. Direct-funded LEAs were visited by one person for one day. In addition, site visits were made to the seven regional offices serving the visited projects. Additional interviews were conducted with members of the review panels that recommended funding for these projects. This totaled approximately 160 person-days of site visits and approximately 500 persons interviewed about Title IV operations.

The project was designed on the assumption that the key to success was the quality of the site visits. For this reason, the same staff that conducted the data analysis was used for most of the site visits. Prior to our site visits, the field work staff underwent three days of intensive training. All eleven of the site visit staff have had research experience and nine are authors or coauthors of research reports.

Site visitors worked with interview guides that provided a common conceptual frame and some specified questions; but some site visit work required that the visitor obtain information informally in an unstructured fashion.

Debriefings were held following each field period. The debriefings lasted from two to four days and involved the entire research staff whenever possible. The debriefings served several functions: They provided for a sharing of data so that in following site visits staff could draw not only upon their own observations but on their knowledge of projects visited by others. The discussion of each project clarified the

conceptual frame and permitted modification of site visit strategies to incorporate new hypotheses. The detailed discussion of each project forced the site visitor to test his or her perception of the project against detailed questioning by others. These discussions served to generate almost all of the hypotheses that were later tested in the analysis. Debriefings also served to expose the competing value positions of different staff members and enabled each of us to understand our own preconceptions about the project. No attempt was made to impose a common conceptual frame upon the staff although one gradually evolved by consensus over the course of the six weeks. The use of debriefings between site visits permitted the data collection, conceptual frame, and hypotheses to evolve gradually over a period of several months. Thus the content of the later site visits was noticeably different from earlier ones.

Coding of site visit data was done at the completion of all site visits. After the last site visit and final debriefings, a conceptual scheme for the study was agreed upon by consensus among the staff and a series of interviewer rating forms was devised and prepared for each visited project and its clients. These forms included measures by which the site visitors for the project rated each project and each observed client on a scale from one to six. The forms provided room to write about the specific situations that accounted for those ratings. These rating forms contained some of the information gleaned from the site visits, which permitted us to combine this information with the mail questionnaire data from the same projects in statistical analysis. A description of forms used in our data analysis is contained in Appendix C.

AN APPRAISAL OF THE METHODOLOGY USED FOR THIS TYPE OF EVALUATION

The analysis that follows draws equally upon two components: a theoretical framework, and a statistical analysis of both the site visit coded data and the mail questionnaire data. Compared to other evaluations, we have perhaps devoted more resources to theoretical argument. However, this seems to be a wise procedure. To report questionnaire results or statistical analyses without embedding them in a theoretical

model would deprive us of the knowledge accumulated by social science in the last two decades of analysis of social systems and in the evaluation of educational programs. But we must caution the reader to examine our theoretical argument carefully, since it is an important part of the evaluation. Central to our interpretation of both "soft" site visit data and "hard" questionnaire data are our judgments about the impact of each project in the school district. We therefore devoted considerable thought to the question of whether these judgments were both reliable and valid.

We defined reliability as the degree to which another site visitor, or another team of site visitors, using the same methodology as used here, would report the same conclusions. There are several possible sources of lack of reliability. One is the random sampling of client school districts. Perhaps in a second random sample, one particular project might be shown to have done exceptional work that did not appear in any of the districts in the first sample. Another source might be the almost random way in which certain facts on occasion are uncovered in a site visit. Information gleaned during a site visit can be markedly affected by the absence of a project staff member who, perhaps, is ill or on a business trip that day. Sometimes, the interviewer overhears an unexpected bit of information during a telephone call to the respondent. Or, new information is revealed because the interviewer follows a particular line of questioning, suggested, perhaps, by the emphasis of the last debriefing, which he may not have followed in an interview, say, two weeks earlier.

We believe that our ratings are reasonably reliable, although we have little statistical evidence to support this view. A reliability experiment was designed for the site visits but proved to be impossible to carry out. We planned to ask each site visitor to independently judge the quality of a Title IV project before discussing that project with the other staff persons present at the same interview. These initial judgments were to be set aside and analyzed later to determine if they were correlated positively. The experiment could not be done for two reasons. First, we found that interviewers did not form judgments about the quality of the projects until after visiting client school districts;

since only one person visited the clients of a particular project, we did not have two judgments to correlate. Second, we found that in the field, staff persons interacted continuously, so that no matter how early in the process one arrived at a "first impression," it was still influenced by the views of other members of the staff.

Nevertheless, we found that the debriefings did not cause interviewers to make many changes in their perceptions about projects. It rarely happened that a debriefing led an interviewer to alter his or her project ratings substantially. One likely source of low reliability in ratings is differences among staff members in the harshness or generosity with which they evaluate a project. We tested this possibility by computing for each staff member the average ratings given; the differences were not statistically significant.

The question of the validity of perceptions is a more difficult one. By validity we mean the degree to which a measurement or observation is in fact a measurement of the phenomenon we wished to measure. Validity is a serious problem in all social science evaluation.* The problem of validity is most acute in the measurement of the overall impact of Title IV projects, for no matter how systematically we have determined the variable that we call impact, the evaluation is dependent upon the measurement of that variable being in fact a measurement of the effectiveness of each project rather than a measurement of something else. One validity study was designed in the course of the project but could not be executed. We began by asking each respondent to give an opinion on the quality of all the Title IV projects in that state. We presumed that if our measurement of effectiveness was valid, an informed and concerned observer, such as a person running another Title IV project in the same state, or a school district staff member whose job it was to recruit assistance from Title IV projects, should have arrived at roughly the same conclusion that we did. However, we found as we carried out the study that respondents were extremely reluctant to say anything negative about other projects and frequently claimed no knowledge of

---

*Most recently, the validity of the standardized achievement test has been called into question, although we know that standardized achievement tests are highly reliable.

them. Client school districts did have a perception of the quality of services that they had received, but this information was used by Rand site visitors in forming their own judgments and consequently can hardly be considered an independent validity check.

The absence of an external validity check on our judgments increased the importance of debriefing sessions. Debate over differences in values and assumptions became more important. By the end of the project we had made a serious effort to arrive at a consensus in which no single value perspective was predominant. To understand this, let us point out one area where we believe that our argument is not greatly influenced by ideology and another area where it may be.

One of the major recommendations of this evaluation is that the desegregation status of the district be used for deciding whether *some but not all* grants should be awarded. If ideology had persevered, we would have taken a stand either in favor of or opposed to desegregation status being used as a criterion for selecting grant recipients, depending on whether our particular research staff as a group favored or opposed school desegregation as a federal intervention strategy. This potential influence is one that existed in past evaluations and one we have tried to avoid. Rather, by examining the operation of each project type in relationship to the question of where intervention could occur with the most impact *if* school desegregation was a desired policy, we arrived at a reasonable strategy combining effective use of policy and funding procedures.

On the other hand, our evaluation reflects a larger bias. As researchers measuring impact, we always looked for change: Did the persons attending a particular training session report changes in attitude, classroom teaching techniques, use of materials? Did the district administrator report any change in a district policy, program, or personnel? Did the project seem to alter the decisionmaking locus at the institutional level in the district? Program impact becomes synonymous with change, and that can be one of the most difficult things to measure. Also, as we shall see, the necessary assumption for this argument--that a specific Title IV project sets district change as a goal or assumes change is possible--is dependent on the circumstances under which the assistance is provided.

The tentative nature of the assumption that change is possible makes this evaluation different from others. Our analysis focuses on relating the frequencies with which certain types of activities are undertaken to a number of independent variables. The purpose is to provide an understanding of how Title IV projects *operate*. In a more traditional evaluation mode, the technique would be to analyze the effectiveness of those operations. It is not clear that Title IV is intended to be a change agent program; in some cases the program is intended to function as a holding operation, as will be described in Sec. II. Here, the decision about what criteria can be used to measure effectiveness cannot be made on the basis of analyzing change alone.

Hence, our analysis focuses as much on mail-questionnaire data and on a description of project operations as on interview ratings and evaluation of those operations, because of the lack of theory on which the program is based and the operational difficulties involved in a cross-sectional study of limited duration (including measuring change).* On the basis of this descriptive material, we suggest that certain programmatic changes might make project operations more efficient. An alternative method of program evaluation--judging effectiveness on the basis of attaining goals that projects set for themselves--is not possible in an extremely large number of cases because of the emphasis of some Title IV projects on handling day-to-day problems. For the remainder, our interviews sometimes took place in the early or middle stages of project development, so effectiveness could not be measured, since the project year had just begun.† Also, project goals were often impossible to

---

*It may be helpful to the reader and to future evaluators of Title IV if we point out a difficulty involved in evaluation research--the lack of candor on the part of respondents. The site visitors often felt that project office personnel saw themselves as being evaluated rather than the program as a whole. It is perhaps human nature to put one's best foot forward at all times; nevertheless, the evaluation would have been much stronger had these respondents openly shown us their weaknesses as well as their strengths, since their weaknesses were invariably displayed when interviewers visited the school districts served by those projects. Lack of candor allowed us to get only one side of the story.

†This is particularly true in the case of more elaborately designed systems such as complicated needs assessment processes involving community groups and multiple input and feedback stages.

measure; how could we find out after the fact whether an Assistant Superintendent had actually changed his or her mind about desegregation? How could we discern glacial movements in attitude change when they were intended as project goals, or "significant movement" towards a community developing a desegregation plan?

The major point of this discussion is that this report is both a description of program operations, followed by a discussion of the implications that follow from that description, and an evaluation based on how effective we judged a specific set of observed outcomes in the school districts we visited.

The format of the report is as follows: The next section discusses the program as specified in the program Regulations and Guidelines and compares its operations to change agent and technical assistance theories. Sections III through VII include an analysis of project types and regional office functions. Sections VIII and IX contain program recommendations and an overview of the Title IV program.

II. TITLE IV OPERATIONS ACCORDING TO REGULATIONS, GUIDELINES, AND STRATEGIES OF INTERVENTION

PROGRAM REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides technical assistance and training services to school districts in various stages of desegregation both through direct grants and indirect assistance by service agencies funded specifically under Title IV. The GAC and SEA are empowered under Section 403 of Title IV to provide both technical assistance and training services to school districts requesting such assistance. Section 404 provides for the establishment of the TI for purposes of offering desegregation-related training services to requesting school districts. Section 405 provides for dfLEAs to hire a desegregation specialist and, in some cases, provides for desegregation-related in-training service. Table 1 shows the distribution of funding levels by project type.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS FOR FY75 BY TITLE IV PROJECT TYPES

Project Type	No. Awarded	Range of Awards ($)	Adjusted[a] Av. Award ($)	% of Total[b]	% Appropriated[c]
SEA	39	20,000 to 324,000	128,964	25	23
GAC	26	184,000 to 962,250	340,188[a]	50	46
TI	47	19,280 to 274,480	93,426	15	20
dfLEA	52	16,000 to 188,714	35,785[a]	10	10

[a]The amount of the average award, after excluding those projects that were more than three standard deviations above the mean.

[b]Total appropriation, $21,700,000.

[c]Total of grants appropriated, $21,572,100.

The legislation describes technical assistance as the provision of "information regarding effective methods of coping with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation." The activities authorized under technical assistance include:

a. Helping a district to desegregate without demoting or dismissing minority staff.
b. Assessing desegregation-related needs in a district.
c. Developing administrative methods and techniques to cope with desegregation-related problems.
d. Developing curricula, teaching methods, and materials for use in desegregated classrooms.
e. Training school personnel in the use of (d).
f. Helping districts develop the capacity for school/community interaction.
g. Helping school staff to utilize other federal and state resources that would assist them in coping with their desegregation-related problems.
h. Training school staff in the preparation of desegregation plans.

Any other activity that the Office of Education deems appropriate in providing technical assistance to desegregating school districts can also be authorized.

Training activities authorized include training school personnel in one or more of the above problem areas except (b) and (g). Training for TIs is defined as "the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation." The institutes may be held on campus or elsewhere, during a summer session or during the regular academic year.

The recipients of both technical assistance and training services in FY75* are school districts that are in some stage of the desegregation

*Title IV awards were made in FY74 on a forward-funded basis (i.e., for activities to be conducted during FY75). Since the project activities

process:

> ...a school board shall be deemed to be "desegregating" if it is implementing or developing a plan for desegregation (i) which has been or will be undertaken pursuant to a final order issued by a court or (ii) which has been required by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare....
> ...a school board shall be deemed to be "desegregated" if (i) it is not under a current legal obligation to desegregate, and (ii) it enrolls in its schools significant proportions of both minority and nonminority group students.

In effect this means that all school districts (not under current court or HEW order) enrolling students of more than one race are either desegregating, or desegregated, and therefore eligible for Title IV assistance.

It ought to be pointed out here that this elaborate system of allocations is applied to a relatively small federal program ($21.7 million in FY75), and that the size of the program has limited both the absolute number of projects and the size of individual projects. This $21.7 million is less than one-tenth the amount dispensed by the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), a program that assists school districts in desegregation through direct grants. So while it is true that the legislation and regulations provide for a wide variety of activities to a large number of school districts, the low level of funding implies that many district-level needs cannot be met in depth through Title IV.

The technical assistance and training services funded by Title IV are essentially services that are under contract to the USOE and provide help to desegregating or desegregated school districts that want such help. The position of the technical assistance and training unit in this relationship is as a noncoercive arm of the federal government. At the time that the units were established, it was hoped that locally based help would be more readily accepted than technical assistance from Washington, the source of most of the sanctions that were requiring districts to desegregate. Title IV has no punitive measures attached to it for school districts, although, upon occasion, judges have referred school districts to their local GAC or SEA for assistance in developing

---

occur in FY75, the projects will be referred to as FY75 projects throughout this report.

a desegregacion plan or in maintaining and operating their schools in a desegregated fashion. The legislation of the Civil Rights Act makes desegregation assistance and training to school districts *available* under one or more Title IV project types. Unlike some sections of the Act, Title IV assistance is not compulsory, and an invitation by the district to the GAC, SEA, or TI is required in both the Act and the Regulations and Guidelines.

In general, the enabling legislation provides for a great deal of latitude in specifying both authorized activities and eligible school districts. The reasons for this are twofold: competing views on what constitutes "legitimate" desegregation assistance and the historic circumstances of Title IV assistance.

Let us suggest that there are three basic-value orientations regarding desegregation-related assistance. The desegregation-oriented view holds that Title IV should be directed toward technical assistance--toward desegregating schools and reassigning students. From this viewpoint, problems that arise within schools after desegregation are outside the immediate purview of the legislation.

We might call the second view integration-oriented. From this perspective, equal attention should be devoted to desegregation and to enabling desegregated schools to overcome their post-desegregation problems of racial inequality or isolation. This view may hold that these activities are intended to prevent the resegregation of desegregated schools, that they are intended to bring about the "integration"* of desegregated schools, and that student reassignment alone conforms with only the letter and not the spirit of the law.

The third view might be called the "equal educational opportunity" orientation. From this perspective, the elimination of racial inequality

---

*Pettigrew (1971) defines *desegregation* simply as a specification of the racial mix within schools, preferably as more than 50 percent white. He defines effective *integration* as the realization of equal educational opportunity, which is to be maximized by the "right" mixture of differing socioeconomic status among students and positive student-body characteristics in a desegregated school setting. In defining integration, or effective school desegregation, other authors (Goodlad, 1967; Katz, 1967-1968; St. John, 1972) also specify such factors as curriculum modifications, changes in school and classroom organization, and the inclusion of students and parents in the decisionmaking process.

and inequality of educational opportunity are not related exclusively to the presence of physical desegregation. All-minority schools as well as all-majority schools both need services--to alter racial attitudes and treatment. From this point of view, the problems of race and education are so broad and so serious that any technical assistance instrument available should be permitted to search for target districts to assist. This viewpoint is held by a wide variety of persons--some who are anti-desegregation, some who are more concerned with problems of educational equality than with problems of racial discrimination, and some who take a very broad view of the nature of the racial problem in American schools.

These three views are not seen as discrete, but as points on a continuum of assistance. We expect that the school districts served by a given Title IV project may range from those whose desegregation-related needs are clear-cut, and so are nearer to the first theory, to those whose needs are more ambiguous because of a number of factors that preclude physical desegregation for the present time. These latter districts may be served by Title IV projects under a philosophy that approaches the third theory.

There is a fine line between the philosophies presented. A historical perspective will help us to understand the distinction. At the time that the Civil Rights Act was drafted in 1964, school desegregation was seen to be an exclusively "Southern" problem. Since that time, our understanding of desegregation has increased to include de facto desegregation that is found in large cities throughout the country but which, in 1964, was seen primarily only in the North and West. After the Civil Rights Act was passed, Southern school districts were given what amounted to blanket orders to desegregate; as they did, Title IV technical assistance was used to meet a clear-cut need, and its funding was almost exclusively in the South. At the time, many districts needed desegregation plans in a hurry and Title IV-funded technical assistance centers wrote desegregation plans.

By 1970, however, most Southern school districts were desegregated and attention began to be focused on the highly isolated racial patterns of school districts in the North. At this time, the Nixon Administration

was highly critical of busing plans and after a number of controversial cases, technical assistance under Title IV was more carefully defined to assure the cooperation of the client school district. This left a situation in which Title IV technical assistance and training units would be allowed to render assistance in virtually all school districts in the South, since those were the districts that were predominantly under court order and where desegregation was an already-perceived need, but only in the North and West school districts that would make a formal admission of needing desegregation-related services.

Since most of the racially isolated schools in the North and West are officially considered "desegregated," the Title IV project may have some difficulty in convincing the school superintendent in such a district that Title IV does have something to offer. The positions taken by the projects and their interpretation of technical assistance, training, and desegregation-related are crucial here. As was mentioned before, the legislation provides the racially isolated Northern school district not under the immediate pressure of a court order with a definition of its status that is nonincriminating: "desegregated school district seeking to maintain or enhance that status." But what services would constitute authorized training or technical assistance under these circumstances? And how do districts and Title IV projects arrive at agreement on what those are? These become major issues when a program that historically began as a response to specific circumstances exists beyond those boundaries.

Even though the guidelines indicate that there is a great deal of overlap between the allowable activities of the various types of Title IV service agencies, personnel in the Office of Education's EEOP office see distinctions between project types. General Assistance Centers, with the widest range of responsibilities, get the largest percentage of the annual Congressional appropriation for Title IV and are seen as closest to the EEOP in goals and philosophy. Although they are usually located on university campuses, often in the School of Education, their staff is not always connected with the ongoing work of the department; thus, rather than being integral parts of their institutions, they are more likely appendages that can cease to exist at the termination of funding.

Thus, in the case of the GAC, the Office of Education is involved not only in desegregation assistance but in institution development and maintenance as well.

Although the SEA's scope of activities is as wide as that of the GAC, there is some difference between them. (Twenty-five percent of the annual Title IV appropriation goes to fund desegregation-related technical assistance and training activities in Title IV units of SEAs.) The SEA is an institution independent of receiving any Title IV grant, and as such has its own institutional goals, some of which may or may not be desegregation-related. As a result, the SEA is seen as much less dependent on the USOE and more structurally distant or inaccessible. Because there is only one State Department of Education in a given state, there is no intrastate competition for SEA grants. This sole-source configuration has led to an interpretation of the regulations that virtually guarantees a SEA Title IV grant to any state department that applies. This probably serves to increase the perceived distance of the SEA from the USOE, although the interpretation was probably originally conceived to ensure that the USOE and the states worked together. At the time the program was shaped, it seemed logical that the State Department of Education should get a sizable portion of the Title IV monies for desegregation assistance. The reasons for this seem to have been twofold:

1. The SEA had a natural entree into any school district in the state and a number of fiscal sanctions and incentives in its power, so that *if desegregation were one of the state department's goals*, Title IV could encourage more desegregation.
2. Since the SEA was an ongoing institution, the USOE would not need to spend any of the Title IV appropriation to a SEA to support institution development. Title IV could add desegregation to the state agenda at a low cost and probably with a high payoff.

The net result is that the USOE is not really sure where it stands with the autonomous SEAs or what it can expect from them in terms of

support for desegregation. The one thing they do seem to be sure of is that state departments are important parts of the education structure.

The TI funded by Title IV is designed to provide a district with improved methods and materials for meeting its desegregation-related needs. This is a more narrowly focused activity than technical assistance, and such institutes receive about 15 percent of the annual Title IV appropriation. Because they are limited to training activities (the SEA and GAC are empowered to do both technical assistance *and* training), such institutes tend not to be institutionalized by refunding year after year but rather operate on an as-needed basis, according to demonstrable problems articulated by one or more school districts in an area. Since TIs are generally located in teacher's colleges, the USOE may hope to influence the preparatory curriculum for teachers in these colleges by funding an institute for a few years. Institute activity typically takes place during the summer months, or during the school year outside of normal classroom hours, because the institute staff usually have other faculty responsibilities. They can then take on the operation of an institute as an additional job or as an augmentation of their regular faculty work. In these cases, the TI itself becomes an appendage that can be discontinued as part of the college structure, but the personnel generally have a continuing relationship with the college. This makes them somewhat more dependent on the USOE than the SEAs are, but not nearly so dependent as the GACs. Here again, the USOE has utilized an existing structure to serve its desegregation goals.

For those districts whose needs cannot be adequately met by either of the other three Title IV agencies, the legislation provides a number of small grants directly to local school boards. These grants account for the remaining 10 percent of the annual appropriation. Generally, the district grants provide only for training services where these are not otherwise available, or for the hiring of a desegregation specialist to undertake in-house assistance. The grants are generally small and last only for one to three years, on the theory that they are to be regarded as district "seed money" rather than as a stable source of continued funding. Once a district discovers a workable mechanism for solving its desegregation-related problems, the mechanism should be

internalized by the administration, and the need for further outside assistance should be reduced as the district's problem-solving capacity grows. Here again, the USOE is involved in utilizing an already existing institution to further the goal of desegregation.

In summary, the regulations provide an operational code, which is interpreted by the regional offices of the USOE to Title IV projects, applicants, and school districts. The basic allocations of Title IV monies are: GACs 50 percent; SEAs 25 percent; TIs 15 percent; and dfLEAs 10 percent. General Assistance Centers receive the largest proportion of Title IV funds, are usually the largest individual projects, and take on the widest scope of activities in both training and assistance activities. State Education Agencies are permitted by the legislation and the regulations to undertake the same activities as GACs, but they typically orient their services more toward assistance than training. Teaching Institutes are specifically in-service vehicles designed to help the teachers, counselors, or administrators from one district or several districts to develop skills for coping with a specific desegregation-related problem. Direct-funded LEA grants are specifically to provide the local school district with the full-time services of a desegregation specialist.

THE INTERVENTION PROCESS: HOW TITLE IV FUNCTIONS AS A CHANGE AGENT PROGRAM

One approach to social intervention might regard Title IV broadly as a change agent program; a change agent is a person or group whose mission is to encourage an institution to change. The change agent concept is not new. Outsiders have been providing consultation and assistance to the process of institutional change for years. Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (1958) were among the first to define the role of this outsider as a change agent, a person who had the skills necessary to help a client work out problems in an integrated step-by-step sequence. This definition was the result of observations on the consultation process, human-relations, organizational development, and group dynamics. Bennis, Benne, and Chin (1969) compiled readings on the roles, objectives, and methods of the change agent in *The Planning of Change*.

The change agent may be external or internal to the organization. The internal change agent theory described by Havelock (1969, 1973) argues that the insider possesses intimate knowledge of the organization to which the outsider is not privy and that he or she does not generate the suspicion and mistrust that an outsider often does, particularly in an organization that is under stress. The operation of Title IV dfLEAs follows this line of thinking. Other change theorists (Lippitt, Watson, and Westley, 1958; Seashore and Van Egmond, 1959) say that only a skilled outside consultant can provide the change of perspective and detachment necessary to produce a significant change in existing organizational behavior and patterns. This line of thought is represented in GACs, SEAs, and TIs.

Whether the change agent is internal or external to the institution being helped, there are four areas in which the change agent literature can shed light on our understanding of Title IV. These are (1) the source of power of the change agent; (2) the role of the change agent; (3) the value context of the change process; and (4) the strategies of implementation used.

The Source of the Change Agent's Power

Bennis and Schein (1969) say that the change agent derives influence with an institution from a combination of *expert* and *line* power. That is, the client sees the change agent as possessing skills or competence that constitute expert power and the agent is seen as occupying a position in some organization that bestows either status or authority--thus *line* power is derived. In Title IV, the GAC and TI would ideally have *expert* power in their client districts, because they are located at the point of training for most educators--the university. The dfLEA is the only aspect of Title IV that has line power, because it has been legitimized as part of the school district organization (even though the advisory specialist may have no traditionally defined line responsibility, access to the superintendent may give that person organizational status or power). The Title IV SEA can have both expert and line power, because although it is not part of the school system per se, the influence of the state department can be such that its position assumes "line" status in the process of acting as an outside "expert."

Because Title IV is a helping program, and because no sanctions are imposed on a school district that does not avail itself of Title IV services, or which does not accept the advice of the technical assistance group, Title IV is considered a noncoercive change agent program. It is important that this noncoercive image be enhanced and maintained, otherwise the client may too easily confuse the Title IV group with other parts of HEW that do have the power to compel desegregation. The delegation of technical assistance and training services to organizations outside the Office of Education helps prevent this association from being made in the school district, but since the districts know the source of the funds, it is not clear just how nonthreatening they regard their local Title IV project.

The way that Title IV technical assistance and training services are put into operation is defined through collaboration between the client school districts and the staff of the particular Title IV project. The importance of participation by the client system in setting goals and strategies for change is underscored in the literature on planned change (Havelock, 1969; Bennis, Benne, and Chin, 1969; Lippitt, Watson, and Westley, 1958).

In school desegregation, the initial definition of need may come from a source external to the Title IV project--typically from some branch of the judicial, legislative, or administrative sections of federal or state government. These branches have the coercive power to force compliance, so once the problem of a school district in the area of desegregation has been defined by one of them, the school district necessarily identifies itself as having a problem.

In the case of the school district not facing the immediate threat of a court order, state mandate, or letter from the Office of Civil Rights in HEW, the course of problem definition is less clear. Whether the district is motivated by the fear of some external mandate, local political pressures, or the social and political preferences of its top administration, needs to which Title IV projects can address themselves are often articulated by a district that is not directly under the pressure of a mandate.

The Role of the Change Agent

This aspect of change agency is difficult to define, since it must vary over time and from place to place. Bennis and Schein (1969) point out four components of the role of the change agent. They are (1) professionalism, (2) marginalism, (3) ambiguity, and (4) insecurity and risk. Bennis and Schein say that the change agent, as a professional, must rely heavily on a body of knowledge with the needs of the client system uppermost.

The marginalism of the change agent is described as an inability to directly participate in the change process. This can make the agent more detached and perceptive, able to see long-range solutions and payoffs, but it may also cause more isolation from the system's realities. In Title IV, this operates only with the *external* projects: the GAC, the SEA, and the TI.

The ambiguity of the role of the change agent can easily be seen by imagining a job description for a Title IV technical assistant. Such an advertisement might read:

> *Wanted.* One technical assistant. Duties may include attending PTA meetings, briefing superintendents and their administrative staffs, testifying in court cases, interviewing various levels of the school community, conducting in-service training, making presentations to school boards, riding on racially tense school buses, writing proposals, etc. Applicant must possess expertise in sociology, anthropology, group dynamics, organizational behavior, education, politics, race relations, and public speaking. Applicant will be working uncertain hours, must be willing to travel, and must be available for work beginning July 1 for a period of uncertain duration.

The insecurity and risk of the change agent's role is a result of the marginalism and ambiguity of the position as well as the precariousness created by the process of change. This can readily be seen in Title IV assistance. Since the projects are funded for one fiscal year at a time, the agent is never assured that he or she will be around to follow through with a client district during the coming year. In addition, resistance to desegregation in the client system may grow to such a magnitude that it is not feasible to continue providing services there.

The Value Context of the Change Agent

This is another critical aspect of change agent theory for Title IV. The literature provides no clear indications as to how a change agent makes decisions about steering a course through the different objectives of the process that various actors are bound to have. This is the area in which advocacy differs from change agency. The advocate can take one value position and then look for clients who are supportive. (Hampden-Turner, 1971; Schon, 1971). The true change agent model demands more commitment to the organization's goals, which may call for shifts in the client orientation of the change agent throughout the relationship. (Bennis, Benne, and Chin, 1969; Harrison and Hopkins, 1967; Kelman, 1965.)

This issue has direct implications for Title IV, since the individual Title IV project is the middleman in the intervention process, which must find a common ground between districts' articulated needs and federal policy. As a noncoercive agent created by the Civil Rights Act, Title IV must fit desegregation assistance into the districts' perception of its educational goals.

STRATEGIES OF INTERVENTION

The literature focuses on three issues that are valuable in an understanding of Title IV: the level in the client system at which the effort is first targeted, which levels must be involved, and the extent of client involvement in the needs assessment and prescription processes. The decision about point of entry or level at which effort is first targeted is agreed to be crucial in the change agency process. Some authors, like Argyris (1962) and Blansfield (1959), assert that change can succeed only if it begins at the top and percolates down, signifying that the point of highest command must be the initiating force. Others, like Schon (1971) and Havelock (1973), see the impetus for change occurring in the perimeter of the organization and infiltrating to the top administration. They argue that the pressures created by this type of change are truly system-transforming, in the sense that it is the lower levels who get the work done anyway. Title IV regulations subscribe to the "top-down" approach in the sense that the district superintendents' approval must be secured (by letter) for any Title IV project operating

in a district, but the regulations also allow for assistance to be directed both generally and specifically to the core and perimeter of a school district. Further, there is an unwritten understanding that the GAC targets both the core and perimeter, the SEA the core, and the TI the perimeter. The important point is that the Title IV program does not subscribe to a single approach to promoting change in school districts.

It is important that the agent not view the district as a monolith, whatever level is targeted. The commitment to school desegregation of the level with which the project is working is the important first step; other levels may be affected over time by the change in environment stimulated by the project. This means that there are four possible trajectories for a Title IV assistance project, as shown in simplified form in Table 2.

Table 2

THE EFFECT OF FOUR LEVELS OF DISTRICT COMMITMENT TO DESEGREGATION ON THE FUNCTION OF TITLE IV

Initial Condition of District	Title IV Services Acceptable to District	Final Condition of District
Total Commitment: Administration and teaching staff committed to change	Transfer of problem-solving skills and teacher training for sensitivity	Successful change
Core Commitment Only: Administration, but not teaching staff, committed to change	Transfer of problem-solving skills, assistance in setting up in-service work with staff	Successfully administered change without staff support, *or* staff becomes committed to change and dfLEA enters condition of *total commitment*
Periphery Commitment Only: Teaching staff, but not administration, committed to change	Teacher training for sensitivity, mobilization of periphery	Improved teacher classroom behavior without administrative support, *or* district administration becomes committed and district enters condition of *total commitment*
No Commitment: Neither administration nor staff committed to desegregation	System-maintaining services only	No change

Table 2 assumes that services can only be targeted to receive clients; e.g., if the administrators do not wish to change, no amount of advice will change their minds. Successful change (here change might be desegregation, or it might be the establishment of good race relations of greater equality, or education in an already desegregated district) can occur only if both the core of the system (the superintendent, school board, and central office staff) and the perimeter (principals and classroom teachers) are receptive to assistance. But the theories of change also argue that if one of these two groups is committed to change, they may be able to use Title IV assistance to exert influence on the other (the top-down and perimeter theories of change). Finally, Table 2 points out that in a district where both core and perimeter are uncommitted to change, Title IV services are likely to become system-maintaining (e.g., in-service programs devoted only to instructional methods or to administrative assistance with routine administrative problems).

The need to involve the client system in the needs assessment and remedy prescription process is underscored by Havelock (1969, 1973); Bennis, Benne, and Chin (1969); Allport (1960); and Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (1958). The importance of this issue in Title IV is further described in the following paragraphs.

Initially, the Title IV project contacts school districts. In the case of GACs and SEAs, some or all of the districts in a regional service area may be contacted in an attempt to let them know of the technical assistance and/or training services available. The TI submits its proposal with a clear delineation of what districts it will work with, so client contact for them is more important in the pregrant stages. Those school districts that see themselves as having desegregation-related problems may respond with an assessment of those problems as they see them. The Title IV unit may accept their assessment of the problem, or they may do some local observation and research and propose an alternative view of the problem. This is the point at which problems, goals, and solutions become "mutually defined" by the technical assistant and the client. This is a vital step in the technical assistance process, because the success of the service depends on its usefulness to the client

system. This point is made clearly by Berman and McLaughlin (1974); Havelock and Havelock (1973); and Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (1958).

In this "mutual definition" process, the perceptions of the problem by both the client and the technical assistant may change and draw closer, or at least their differences of perspective may become more clear. Many Title IV projects have developed an iterative process that was designed to bring their perceptions and their clients into line, or to illuminate the areas where they differed.

The next steps in the technical assistance relationship created by Title IV are often the formal recognition of the desegregation-related goals of the client, a brief statement of what is expected of the Title IV group in reaching that state, and what responsibilities or commitments the school district assumes in accepting that help. These are often presented in the form of a letter or a small proposal drawn up by both the Title IV project and the district.

In addition, it is vital that the change strategy proposed by the Title IV unit be something that the district has a stake in achieving, otherwise the technical assistance or training given will serve only to perpetuate the status quo. McLaughlin and Berman (1975) and Schon (1971) demonstrate this in analyses of bureaucratic responses to change attempts. Schon describes the "dynamic conservatism" of organizations that will change as little as possible to meet the demands of their external environment. Only when the pressure to change becomes threatening to the organization are concessions to the change made. Berman and McLaughlin have observed that at that point, if the value system is not reevaluated to make the change an important internal goal, the organization is likely to do one of three things: (1) aggressively resist any change; (2) adopt the trappings of change while maintaining the behaviors and attitudes that existed before; or (3) ignore it altogether.

The application of this approach to school desegregation is clear. Districts can be made to desegregate, but they cannot be made to *want* to desegregate. Most of the research on school desegregation is derived from empirical case studies, and several of those case studies underline the importance of commitment of school administration to desegregation in contributing to its success (Kirby, Crain, and Harris, 1973; U.S.

Commission on Civil Rights, 1973; Crain, et al., 1968). As a result, Title IV technical assistance and training can be most helpful when the client district is committed to desegregation.

Yet, we can safely assume that most districts are not committed to desegregation; and in the face of this lack of commitment, we can expect the commitment of the technical assistance group itself to waver, for two reasons. First, without district commitment, the Title IV project cannot do its job adequately. A Title IV unit may be well versed in desegregation planning. Its staff may be aware of all of the versions of various strategies and their relative merits. But they cannot be expected to know the geography, demography, sociology, and politics that make up each of their client districts. Clearly, the district-level people have this area of expertise and unless both staffs work together the plan cannot be as successful. In this situation, the Title IV staff is as much a recipient in the technical assistance process as the school district. Each participant is expanding his or her skills and knowledge to a set of information not previously explored. If the technical assistants are closed off from the mainstream of the system as it desegregates, the opportunities for meaningful interaction and growth are limited, and neither the client school district nor the Title IV team can maximally benefit.

Second, though in principle Title IV assistance can be either *passive* (offered as the result of specific requests from clients), or *active* (initiated by the assistance group), most of the incentives are for a Title IV project to remain passive and offer only those services requested by its clients. This passivity is established by the requirement for a specific letter of request from the superintendent of each client district. Passivity is further supported by the use of general forms for needs assessment, which all GAC clients must complete, and it is often reinforced by the district's reluctance to articulate and confront the true causes of its desegregation problems. Finally, an aggressive Title IV project risks the possibility of direct political intervention by the client to the USOE or to the university or state government housing the Title IV group, which can subvert the assistance and punish the technical assistance group and also help create a climate that will endanger future

desegregation policy. As a result, the GAC or SEA may be forced into a passive position dealing with peripheral issues at the invitation of the district. Under these circumstances, it may be difficult for them to have any positive impact on the district's desegregation efforts. As a result, the assistance they give has a limited growth potential for the project staff, since they cannot get feedback from the school system about their impact on the progress of desegregation. In this way, their skills may be enhanced only in peripheral services rather than in the capacity to help districts learn how to desegregate. Over time, this may make them less useful as true desegregation assistants although their value and popularity as a service agency may grow.

We are thus led to a pessimistic view of Title IV's potential as a change agent program. Title IV must operate in a narrowly prescribed opportunity situation to promote change in the area of school desegregation, because circumstances in its client school districts or in the projects may preclude the possibility of a helping relationship which is based on mutual goal-setting, trust, and a willingness to change.

SUMMARY

In reviewing the change agent literature, we find that Title IV can operate as a change agent under a narrow set of circumstances; the political reality of the desegregation situation combines with the formal constraints under which the Title IV program must operate to limit the opportunities. These limiting conditions include: the willingness of the client district to accept change; the passivity or activity of the Title IV project; the source and mobilization of power for change in school districts; the elements of professionalism, marginalism, ambiguity, and insecurity that characterize the role of the Title IV change agent; the strategies of intervention employed by the agent and the degree of involvement of the client system in the selection of those strategies; and, finally, the often conflicting desegregation contexts in which Title IV assistance occurs.

These issues will arise again in the data analysis: The source of the change agent's power becomes an important issue in dfLEA grants.

The degree of involvement with clients by GACs is an important element in their desegregation assistance. The district desegregation environment is explored fully in later sections.

III. GENERAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS

In FY75, 26 GACs were operating. The GAC is the largest of the project types; sometimes its service area can include all the school districts in three states. The average grant to a GAC was $340,188; the average number of school districts served was 98. This assistance was provided, on the average, by a staff of nine persons, eight of whom were full-time.

Mail questionnaires were sent to each of the GAC Project Directors, with 24 of the 26 Directors responding for a 92 percent return rate. In addition, 12 GACs (46 percent of those funded) and 36 of their client school districts were visited on-site.

This section of the report will describe the Title IV GACs, based on data received both from the mail questionnaires and our site visits. We will begin with a discussion of project office characteristics and continue with a discussion of the interaction of GACs with other Title IV agencies, levels of government, and the school district itself. The SEAs, TIs, and dfLEAs will be described in the sections that follow.

PROJECT OFFICE CHARACTERISTICS

In describing the GAC office characteristics we will be discussing their management, staffing, and organizational capabilities. In this section, and throughout the report, we will describe a project by comparing and contrasting it to the other Title IV project types. General Assistance Centers will be compared primarily to SEAs given that both GACs and SEAs are authorized to conduct the same activities according to the Regulations and Guidelines governing the administration of Title IV. Comparisons between GACs and all other project types will be limited to specific contexts in which they engage in similar activities or exhibit similar organizational characteristics.

Activity Profile

Table 3 shows the activities most frequently and least frequently undertaken by GACs and points out which activities they are more or less

Table 3

GAC ACTIVITY PROFILE

Activities *More* Often Undertaken by GACs Than by SEAs[a]	GAC	SEA	Activities Undertaken Frequently by Both Types[b]
Develop new instructional techniques	87	55	X
Train in use of new methods/materials	83	67	X
Develop curricula	77	47	
Help districts assess needs	75	59	X
Develop techniques for school/community interaction	71	66	X
Develop new administrative procedures	63	42	
Facilitate sharing of common experiences	54	47	
Develop evaluation techniques	27	12	

Activities *Less* Often Undertaken by GACs Than by SEAs[a]	GAC	SEA	Activities Undertaken Infrequently by Both Types[c]
Write proposals	50	76	
Develop and disseminate materials	46	56	
Interpret federal guidelines	39	65	
Help districts cope with crisis	33	40	X
Help develop desegregation plans	18	39	X
Prevent dismissal or displacement of minorities	9	32	X
Obtain statistical information	9	58	
Assess new desegregation capabilities	4	29	X

[a]Percent of Project Directors responding that the activity was undertaken "most frequently."

[b]Activities undertaken frequently by 50 percent or more of both GACs and SEAs.

[c]Activities undertaken frequently by less than 50 percent of both GACs and SEAs.

likely to undertake than SEAs. As can be seen from this table, GACs frequently undertake in-service training, develop curricula and materials, assist districts in needs assessment, and help districts with school/community relations.

In addition, we see from Table 3 that both SEAs and GACs frequently undertake a number of the same activities, specifically: developing new instructional techniques, training personnel in the use of new methods, helping districts assess their desegregation needs, and developing techniques for school/community interaction. Only infrequently do either GACs or SEAs assist districts in the development of their desegregation plans, help to ensure that minority personnel are not demoted or dismissed, help districts to assess their capabilities for new desegregation, or help districts cope with crises. From this, one might be tempted to conclude that districts are receiving the same services from these two agencies. In practice, however, we generally found this not to be the case.

Client school districts, including those receiving services from both the GAC and SEA simultaneously, generally perceived these agencies as offering distinct services. There are a number of reasons why client school districts may make this distinction. For one, SEAs are a part of the State Departments of Education, which have ongoing relationships with the school districts in their state. It seems reasonable, therefore, that school districts request desegregation assistance from SEAs in those areas that they consider to be within the purview of the state department (and, conversely, to refrain from requesting assistance from SEAs in areas where school districts do not want any [more] state interference). Table 3 supports this view; it shows that SEAs are noticeably more likely than GACs to help districts write ESAA or other proposals to obtain additional funds, conduct surveys to write statistical information that will assist in identifying desegregation problems, help districts understand their responsibilities under the desegregation guidelines, and disseminate to the districts materials on school desegregation--all of which could be considered typical state department activities in that they involve assisting districts in work required to meet state or federal laws, regulations, or funding requirements.

General Assistance Centers, on the other hand, share no such ties to state government and, as Table 3 shows, are less likely to carry out activities that are government-oriented and are more likely to develop curriculum, instructional techniques, and administrative procedures. These activities could be considered more typical for an educational institution to undertake, and although this might imply that GACs function similarly to TIs, this is not the case. Teaching Institutes have a much narrower focus than GACs; TIs are authorized to conduct training and are not authorized to undertake technical assistance. In addition, TIs are usually located in departments or schools of education at universities and colleges. Training of school personnel, whether it be desegregation-related or not, is recognized as a legitimate activity for education departments to undertake. Therefore, TIs do not need to convince school districts that they, as organizations, are capable of delivering training services. All but one of the GACs are located in universities. Since desegregation assistance to school districts is not normally a university function, without a Title IV grant the GAC would have no institutional life of its own. Furthermore, since school districts generally would not be receiving technical assistance of this kind from a university, they have no preconceived notion regarding the types of activities they would expect a GAC to undertake. As a result, prior to receiving a Title IV grant, a GAC is faced with the problem of developing a viable organization capable of delivering a myriad of services, and of convincing potential client school districts of the worth of the organization. That is, while external to the educational process GACs, first, must be able to convince school districts that they, as an organization, can deliver services, and second, that these services will be of benefit to the district.

A GAC which has been operational for a number of years is able to establish credibility on the basis of its proven track record. A newly funded GAC, on the other hand, has to expend a great deal of effort to build solid relationships with its client districts. One newly funded GAC that we visited dealt with this problem by willingly considering any requests from the districts that were even vaguely desegregation-related. It was their assumption that over time, as districts came to

see their worth, they would be in a better position to exert more influence in mutually redefining requests from the districts. In other words, this GAC's strategy was first to establish credibility as a legitimate service organization prior to placing much emphasis on what the content of these services should be.

General Assistance Centers, more than any of the other Title IV projects, have to function as viable organizations to deliver a wide range of services. We would therefore expect the ways in which GACs organize themselves to affect their ability to deliver services that impact on client school districts. As Table 4 shows, all of the following project office characteristics are positively associated with GAC impacts at a local level:*

1. The presence of an organized planning function.
2. Management and organization.
3. Defined operational procedures.

---

*Upon completion of our field visits, our interviewers rated project offices along a number of dimensions, including the impact they were having on the client school districts that we visited. These impacts were defined as broadly as possible in order to maximize the probability of their occurrence. The Summary Index of Impact, used here and throughout this report, is a simple summation of the ratings on the following components:

Policy/Program/Personnel impacts, which include such things as the project office's effect on a district's policies, programs, personnel recruitment, and contact with other personnel outside of the local school district.

Institutional impacts, which include, for example, the project office's success in involving the community in the district's desegregation effort, in facilitating the community's access to the district's formal structure, and in altering the district's routine procedures, loci of decisionmaking, and the roles of individual actors within the district.

Training impacts, which include the effect a project's training has had on the way a participant performs his/her job, the participant's job skills, and his/her attitude.

Each project office visited was rated on the following impacts, depending upon project type:

Policy/ Program/ Personnel	Institutional	Training
GAC	GAC	GAC
SEA	SEA	--
TI	--	TI

4. Intraoffice communication.
5. Staff capability.

Table 4

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROJECT OFFICE AND SUMMARY INDEX OF IMPACTS

Project Office Characteristics	Project Type		
	GAC	SEA	TI
Organized planning function	.597[a]	.254	.298
Management/organization	.653[b]	.198	.000
Operations	.816[b]	.385[c]	.602[a]
Interoffice communications	.589[c]	.000	.086
Staff capabilities	.656[a]	.264	.224

NOTE: The measure of association used in this table, as in all tables in this report, is tau-beta (t_B). This nonparametric statistic is more conservative than gamma (γ), since the latter can yield a perfect relationship when all cases in the off diagonal are located in a single cell. An alternative measure (t_C) includes a computation for ties which is probably too conservative given the nature of survey data.

[a] t_B significant at .01 level.

[b] t_B significant at .001 level.

[c] t_B significant at .05 level.

With the single exception of defined operational procedures, by which we mean the ability of the projects to implement their activities and to adhere to their schedule as planned, no other variable significantly correlated with either the SEA or TI having an impact on client school districts. Among the project offices that we visited, characteristics such as having a well-specified plan, containing explicit schedules and milestones and a clear description of staff responsibilities, were significantly correlated with the impact of the GAC at the district level, but these same relationships did not hold for the SEAs or TIs. As we witnessed in our site visits, GACs that displayed these characteristics seemed better able not only to articulate but also to pursue specific

desegregation-related goals. In addition, by providing a structured *method* their client districts were able to participate in assessing their needs and developing programs specific to meeting those needs.

For the purpose of analysis, the activities on the GAC activity list were divided into three clusters: desegregation, technical assistance, and training, on the basis of intercorrelation matrices of activities for each project type. Activities that did not correlate with the other activities in the cluster, or which correlated with activities in other clusters, were eliminated. As a result, the following clusters were identified for the GAC and SEA projects:

Cluster	Activities
Desegregation	Preventing dismissal or displacement of minorities
	Assisting districts in developing desegregation plans
	Assessing new desegregation capabilities
Technical Assistance	Proposal-writing activity
	Developing and disseminating materials
	Gathering statistical information
	Maintaining libraries
Training	Training in uses of new methods/materials
	Training directors of local projects (GAC only)
	Training supervisory personnel (GAC only)

Since GACs, unlike both SEAs and TIs, need to develop a viable, working organization that is capable of delivering a broad range of services to a large number of school districts, we would predict that it would take time to develop such an organization and that over time a GAC would be able to offer a wider scope of services. Table 5 illustrates that this indeed appears to be the case. While none of the relationships are statistically significant, the longer a GAC has been funded the more likely it is to undertake all *types* of activities. This relationship has implications for the funding of GACs. If, as we are suggesting, GACs need to develop viable organizations to be effective, and the longer a GAC has been operating the better able it is to develop this organization, then

multiyear funding should be adopted for GACs. Multiyear funding would better allow GACs to develop a long-range plan, and to establish credibility with the districts they serve.

Table 5

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YEARS OF PROJECT FUNDING AND TYPES OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY GACs

Types of Activities Undertaken	Years of Continuous Project Funding
Desegregation	.173
Technical assistance	.269
Training	.124

Staffing

Viewing GACs as independent organizations, we expected the characteristics of their staff to be different from the characteristics of the SEA and TI staffs and for these director and staff characteristics to have an effect on the impact of services delivered. That is, we expected the staff and their prior experience and areas of expertise to affect not only the GACs' programs but their ability to relate to client school districts as well. This expectation was only partially met. Sections of the mail questionnaires were devoted to collecting data on the background characteristics of both the directors and their staffs. Table 6 shows a comparison of these Project Director and project staff characteristics across all four project types. The characteristics of the dfLEA staff are the most distant: dfLEA staff members tend more often to be minority, with previous school experience but without previous human relations training; dfLEA Project Directors tend more often to be women, are younger, do not have either an Ed.D. or Ph.D. degree, but do have more on-the-job desegregation experience. The characteristics of SEA personnel are distinguished from GAC and TI personnel in that the SEA Project Directors tend more often to have been district superintendents, they are older, and tend not to have a Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree. On the other hand, GAC Project Directors tend to be almost exclusively men with either Ed.D. or Ph.D. degrees.

Table 6

PERSONNEL CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Project Type			
	GAC	SEA	TI	dfLEA
Project Staff: Demographic Characteristics (means)				
% men	58	63	54	54
% 50 years or older	14	19	8	14
% minority	52	61	60	76
Project Staff: Types of Experience (means)				
% human relations training	58	60	64	47
% school system experience	76	76	74	83
% on-the-job desegregation experience	69	68	67	68
Project Director: Demographic Characteristics (means)				
% men	96	89	88	72
% 50 years or older	29	44	19	10
% minority	59	56	40	51
% Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree	83	34	67	11
Project Director: Types of Experience (means)				
% school system experience	92	85	90	95
% on-the-job desegregation experience	38	48	38	70
% district superintendent	18	28	11	3

Table 7 shows the jobs held most recently by GAC, SEA, and TI Project Directors. Project Directors of GACs and TIs were primarily instructors

Table 7

MOST RECENT JOB PRIOR TO BECOMING PROJECT DIRECTOR
(In percent)

Job	GAC	SEA	TI
Another position on Title IV staff	21	19	11
Another position at institution	42	25	55
Position in school district	21	27	11

[a]University or college where GAC or TI located; for SEAs, the state department.

at the college or university at which the project is now located prior to becoming directors of the Title IV project. In fact, 42 percent and 59 percent of the GAC and TI directors, respectively, have teaching duties at their institutions in addition to administering the Title IV project. Thus, many GAC and TI directors still maintain the role of professional educator--a role that is consonant with the training activities both project types undertake. Nevertheless, the GAC and TI are different in the sense that GAC directors tend to come more frequently from either a school district or from another position on the Title IV staff than do TI directors. The relationship that GACs have with their client school districts would encourage this kind of recruitment pattern; since GACs serve in a general, all-purpose consultative role to their districts, prior experience on the GAC staff or in a school district would facilitate the ability of GAC directors to function in this role.

However, the previous experience of the director or staff appears to have no statistically significant relationship to the kinds of activities a GAC or SEA undertakes or the impact of the GAC or SEA in the client school districts that we visited. (See Tables 8 and 9.)

Table 8

RELATIONSHIP OF STAFF AND PROJECT DIRECTOR EXPERIENCE TO TYPES OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN

Activity Undertaken	Staff Experience					
	Previous School System Experience		Previous Experience in a Desegregated School System		Previous Human Relations Experience	
	GAC	SEA	GAC	SEA	GAC	SEA
Desegregation	.054	.054	.100	-.192	.050	-.034
Technical assistance	-.024	-.198	-.059	-.208	.126	-.298
Training	-.235	-.226	-.163	-.099	.027	-.185
	Director Experience					
	Previous School System Experience		Previous Experience in a Desegregated School System		Highest Degree Received by Director	
	GAC	SEA	GAC	SEA	GAC	SEA
Desegregation	-.006	.031	-.147	.030	-.307	.197
Technical assistance	-.226	-.015	.070	.045	.037	-.102
Training	-.034	-.247	.107	.169	.017	-.217

Table 9

RELATIONSHIP OF STAFF AND PROJECT DIRECTOR EXPERIENCE TO SUMMARY INDEX OF IMPACT

Personnel Experience	Summary Index of Impact	
	GAC	SEA
Staff		
Having previous school system experience	-.506	.118
Having previous experience in desegregated school system	-.250	.039
Having previous human relations experience	-.180	-.118
Director		
Having previous school system experience	.255	-.101
Having previous experience in desegregated school	-.220	.168

In our field experiences, we found a number of characteristics of the project staffs that we felt to be instrumental in their ability to deliver services, but we are not able to measure their effect. For example, several project offices were noteworthy for the high level of esprit de corps among the staff members and for the belief they exhibited in the work they were doing. These projects could best be described as committed. On the other hand, several other GAC project offices were staffed primarily by Ph.D. candidates who viewed their role with the GAC as an interim position until their degrees were completed and thus approached their job passively. They *appeared* much less committed to their Title IV work. However, it might also be the case that staff who are simultaneously students and workers at a center may face competing incentives between the university and the GAC. It may not be in the universities' incentive structure to push for desegregation and change at the district level.

In a number of instances, we found that the GAC director had made an explicit decision *not* to hire personnel with Ph.D. or Ed.D. degrees and, in one case, graduate students as well. In some cases, the directors felt that staff members who had doctoral degrees would be less able to relate to district personnel. ("A Ph.D. is a pretty heavy burden to

take into a rural school district.") Where graduate students were excluded, the director felt that students in graduate school would be unable to handle both roles satisfactorily, given the demands of the project. Another GAC director explicitly stated that in selecting their consultants, they looked for someone who already had an ongoing relationship with a particular school district. Prior familiarity with the districts being served appeared to be an important asset for several of the GAC directors as well. It not only served as a method of entry into the districts, but prior knowledge of the area being served and the personnel involved enabled these directors to be particularly sensitive to the political and social arenas in which these districts operated. Furthermore, in several of the GACs that we visited, the project staff members had very little contact with district personnel and were used almost exclusively as managers. These projects maintained an extremely large bank of consultants (300 to 400) who were called in, depending on their expertise, to conduct the various project activities.

We believe certain other characteristics of project personnel may be important for effective service delivery. However, these characteristics are not readily measured without taking into account the interaction between these specific characteristics with the specific context of assistance or the specific types of activities. As a result, we cannot identify such characteristics with any degree of certainty.

Implementation Problems

In this subsection we will examine the types of problems encountered by GACs as they implement their programs.

On the whole, GACs are less apt to receive a cut in the amount of funds they request than are SEAs, TIs, or dfLEAs (38 percent of all GACs report receiving less than the requested amount of funds compared to 50 percent for SEAs, 65 percent for TIs, and 64 percent for dfLEAs). However, among those GACs that did not receive the amount of funding they requested, an average of 70 percent of the requested amount was received--an average that is approximately equal to that of the TIs and SEAs but substantially above the amount received by the dfLEAs (49 percent). Table 10 shows Project Directors' reports of what cuts have been made.

Table 10

BUDGET CUTS--GAC PROFILE

Type of Cut	Project Type			
	GAC	SEA	TI	dfLEA
Type *more* often reported by GACs than other projects[a]				
Reduction in funding for some activities	78	65	58	44
Reduction in staff or staff time	56	41	42	56
Reduction in purchase of equipment or materials	33	23	15	16
Reduction in amount of stipend offered participants	22	18	4	(b)
Type *less* often reported by GACs than other projects[a]				
Elimination of specific activities	33	53	31	72
Fewer districts (schools) served	11	23	12	8
Reduction in travel by project staff	0	29	39	(b)
Reduction in travel allowance offered participants	0	18	8	(b)

[a]Percent of Project Directors reporting "yes" to specific cuts.

[b]Questions not asked of dfLEA Project Directors.

General Assistance Centers are more likely to reduce funding for some activities, reduce staff or staff time, reduce the purchase of equipment or materials, and reduce the amount of stipend offered participants than are any other project types. They are less likely than SEAs to reduce the number of districts served or to eliminate specific activities. In contrast to SEAs or TIs, GACs also do not reduce the amount of travel undertaken by the project staff.

Of the four types of reductions most often mentioned by GAC Project Directors when their budgets are cut back, two have a significant effect on the types of activities undertaken. As we see from Table 11, GACs that reduce their staffs or staff time undertake significantly less desegregation-oriented activities. On the other hand, a reduction in staff or in the purchase of equipment or materials is significantly related to undertaking more training activities. In our site visits we noted that training activities for a GAC tend more often to be of the

Table 11

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GAC BUDGET CUTS AND TYPES OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN[a]

Type of Cut	Type of Activity		
	Desegregation	Technical Assistance	Training
Reduction in funding for some activities (78%)	.033	.102	.223
Reduction in staff or staff time (56%)	-.481[b]	.125	.413[b]
Reduction in purchase of equipment or materials (33%)	.072	.169	.207[c]
Reduction in amount of stipend offered participants (22%)	.382	-.074	.065

[a]The statistical significance of nonparametric statistics is affected by the marginal distributions. Therefore, in some cases, some t_Bs that appear in the table and are larger than others, but do not obtain statistical significance, are those with extremely skewed distributions.

[b]t_B significant at the .001 level.

[c]t_B significant at the .05 level.

multidistrict variety, whereas training activities undertaken by the TIs tend to be district-specific. Therefore, if a GAC had originally planned to offer a multidistrict workshop, they would probably continue to offer it regardless of whether or not their budget was subsequently cut, since this activity is cost-effective in serving a number of client districts at the same time. On the other hand, desegregation-oriented activities, by which we mean helping districts plan to prevent the dismissal or displacement of minority personnel, develop desegregation plans, and assess their capabilities for new desegregation, are activities that are very district-specific. General Assistance Centers that undertake these desegregation types of activities need staffs of sufficient size to permit one or several staff members to work closely with a given district.

GAC INTERACTIONS WITH OTHER TITLE IV AGENCIES, LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Previously we saw that GACs are different from SEAs and TIs in that they tend to undertake a broader range of services and are involved in institution-building as well as in the delivery of services to client districts. Now we shall see that GACs are also different from SEAs and TIs in terms of the levels in the client system to which their efforts are aimed. As Table 12 shows, GACs target their activities to district superintendents with nearly the same frequency as do SEAs, more often target their activities to other district administrators, and less often to school board members. They also target their activities to all administrative core personnel more than twice as often as do TIs.

Table 12

TARGETING OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES[a]

Target	Project Type		
	GAC	SEA	TI
School board members	29	37	17
District superintendents	88	89	39
Other district administrators	83	69	42
Principals	83	67	83
Teachers	83	71	95
Counselors	92	39	59
School support staff	63	21	33

[a]Percent of Project Directors responding that activities are "frequently" directed to these personnel.

In terms of school personnel, GACs much more often direct their activities to principals, teachers, counselors, and school support staff than do SEAs, and more often to all categories except teachers for TIs. In general, GACs tend to target their activities to *all* levels of participants. Teaching Institutes generally work with school-level personnel; SEAs generally work with administrative-level personnel. Thinking back to the GAC activity profile and how it compares to the SEA and TI profiles, it becomes apparent that differences would exist in how these

three project types target their activities. Training activities of the type undertaken by a TI would naturally be focused at school-level personnel. Technical assistance activities of the type that SEAs engage in would tend to be targeted to the district core personnel. Since GACs frequently undertake both of these kinds of activities--technical assistance and training--it follows that their activities will be aimed at both administrative and school levels.

The planning profile for GACs also shows more breadth (Table 13). They show the highest percentage of interaction with district superintendents in the planning stage than either the SEA or TI, a higher level of interaction with principals and teachers than the SEA, and an equal level of interaction in planning with principals (although much less interaction in planning with teachers) than the TI.

Table 13

PLANNING OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES[a]

Participants in Planning	Project Type		
	GAC	SEA	TI
Federal-Level Personnel			
USOE regional Program Officer	35	56	53
Other USOE regional personnel	4	28	14
Own Institution			
Other personnel at institution where project office is located	13	39	43
District Personnel			
Superintendents	66	60	61
Principals	46	26	47
Teachers	38	23	60

[a]Percent of Project Directors reporting "active" or "very active" participation of various groups in the decision concerning which activities to undertake.

Given that GACs function as general, all-purpose service agencies, we would predict that they would involve others in their planning only on an as-needed basis. In other words, GACs would be most likely to

involve district superintendents in planning, since they need to elicit the support of the superintendents to deliver assistance and training in their districts. We would expect principals to be the next most frequently involved group, since GACs may need to obtain permission from the principals to deliver assistance at the school level. General Assistance Centers would be less likely than TIs to involve teachers in project planning, since TIs more frequently target their activities to teachers than do GACs. Other than involving district personnel in project planning to generate support for their activities, we do not find that GACs actively involve other personnel, such as members of the institution at which they are located or personnel from other agencies, in the planning of their activities. Regional Title IV personnel and other members of the university at which the GAC is located were more infrequently involved in planning the project's activities than other project types.

Table 14 illustrates some important differences in who participates in the decision concerning which activities a GAC will offer.

Table 14

ACTIVITY TYPES BY LEVELS OF DECISIONMAKER

Participants in Planning[a]	Type of Activity		
	Desegregation	Technical Assistance	Training
Federal-level personnel	.173	-.214	.000
Personnel at host institution	-.329	.051	.192
District-level personnel	.268	.000	.020

[a]Percent of Project Directors reporting participation of these groups in the decision concerning which activities to undertake.

It is interesting to note that involvement of the regional office in GAC planning is associated with the GAC undertaking more desegregation types of activities. This is perhaps an indication that at the regional-office level, GACs are viewed as the most likely vehicle through which desegregation-related assistance can occur. As we shall see later, this is directly the opposite from the SEA case, where involvement of

the regional office in planning is associated with the SEA undertaking more technical assistance types of activities.

Involvement of university personnel in GAC planning is associated with the GAC undertaking *less* desegregation-oriented activities and *more* training activities. On the one hand, training activities would tend to be undertaken more frequently when university personnel are involved in planning, since these activities would carry over most directly into ongoing university functions. On the other hand, training might be undertaken more frequently when the university is involved, because training activities may be viewed as "safe," that is, training may be considered less likely to upset alumni or university officials than would desegregation activities, which could seem too controversial for a university affiliate to undertake. Finally, we note that the district-level involvement with GACs in planning is associated with desegregation-related work more frequently. We shall see later that this association does not hold for either the SEA or TI project types, implying that districts may more often view the GACs as providing desegregation assistance.

Table 15 further illustrates the importance of district intervention methods for GACs as opposed to other project types. Unlike either the SEA or TI, the method of interacting with district-level personnel

Table 15

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISTRICT INTERACTION VARIABLES AND SUMMARY INDEX OF IMPACT[a]

Variable	Project Type		
	GAC	SEA	TI
Method of access to district pivotal people	.528[b]	.420	.224
Depth of community contacts	.729[c]	.527[b]	.501
Depth of administrative contacts	.753[c]	.360	.200
Flexibility of response	.511[b]	.377	.527

[a] Summary Index of Impact is described in detail on p. 36.

[b] t_B significant at the .05 level.

[c] t_B significant at the .001 level.

is an important element in a GAC having an impact at the district level. Table 15 shows the four interaction variables positively associated with a GAC having an impact at the local level. The correlations between these district interaction variables and GAC impact reflect the importance of organized procedures for interacting with school districts.

For example, in the projects we visited, the depth of a project's community and administrative contacts is significantly associated with the impact a GAC has on the district. In addition, the method by which GACs access pivotal people in the district is also significantly related to their impact. To give an example of how such interaction might take place, in one of the centers we visited the staff insists upon first sitting down with the district superintendent and coming to agreement on goals and methods to be used in that particular district. They then require that a district member who has direct access to the superintendent be designated as the GAC contact person. The GAC requires that this contact perform certain duties, such as keeping a written log of GAC-affiliated district activities, and in turn the contact is paid for performing these duties out of center funds. This approach was used by the GAC as a method of keeping the superintendent more informed of its activities, and also as a mechanism to ensure that someone in the district was highly motivated to pursue desegregation-related activities.

Also, the degree to which a GAC is willing to adjust its procedures to meet the contingencies operating at the district level significantly affects the impact of the GAC at the district level (see Table 15). Flexibility is very important for GACs, given the large number of districts that they service. Indeed, in some of the project offices that we visited, districts in one part of the GAC's service area were very different from districts in another part of the service area in terms of their outlooks and the problems they faced. The GAC program must be flexible enough to deal with these differences; prepackaged activities supposedly useful to all districts often prove too inflexible to work.

To emphasize the importance of comprehensive district interaction patterns more clearly, Table 16 shows that GACs that are more active in conducting a needs assessment tend to undertake desegregation-related activities more often. This finding suggests that GACs that undertake

Table 16

RELATIONSHIP OF GAC INVOLVEMENT IN NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND KINDS OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN

Kinds of Activities Undertaken	Degree to which GACs Assess Needs for Districts
Desegregation	.387[a]
Technical assistance	.058
Training	-.067

[a] t_B significant at .01 level.

these activities more often tend to work more closely with their client school districts. That is, they tend to take a more active role in both defining district needs and in directing their activities to all levels of personnel in the district. A GAC that undertakes a well-developed needs assessment tends to do so with a specific plan for uncovering desegregation-related needs. For example, one GAC's needs assessment process included holding local as well as central office meetings with a planned interaction between the two levels after the needs assessment data were collected. The result was an increased awareness at all levels about district problems and the desegregation basis of them.

SUMMARY

General Assistance Centers function as omnibus service organizations, delivering a broad range of activities to a large number of school districts. Since this requires an effective organization, we find that both organizational characteristics and planned methods of district interaction are important determinants of a GAC's impact on the district.

Since GACs plan and target their activities more often than the other project types to both core and perimeter personnel in a school district, they have the greatest potential for effecting change at the school district level, since they use multiple entry points into the school system more often. In contrast, we shall see that SEAs work more often with the core and TIs with the perimeter; these service organizations can effect change only if targeted groups are in turn able to influence the other parts of the system.

IV. STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

The Title IV SEA is usually housed in a Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity in a State Department of Education; its service area includes all the school districts in a state. In FY75, 39 SEAs were operating; their average grant size was $128,964. State Education Agencies serve an average of 90 school districts with an average of 4 full- and part-time staff, 3 of whom are full-time. Project Directors of SEAs tend more often than the other project administrators to have been district superintendents before occupying their present position; they are usually older and tend not to have an Ed.D. or Ph.D. degree (see Table 6).

Mail questionnaires were sent to each of the SEA Project Directors, with 36 of the 39 responding (92 percent). In addition, 13 SEAs (33 percent of those funded) and 26 of their client school districts were visited on site by Rand personnel. This section presents the findings from the data analysis based on both the mail questionnaires and our site visits.

This section will be organized in the same manner as the previous one, which discusses the GAC. The discussion begins with project office characteristics and continues with a discussion of interaction with other Title IV agencies, levels of government, and the school district itself. As in all other sections, the purposes are to indicate both how the SEA separates itself from the other Title IV project types and what variables are responsible for impacts of the SEA at the school district level.

PROJECT OFFICE CHARACTERISTICS

The activity profile of the SEAs, which was highlighted earlier, will be reemphasized here. The general finding (Table 3) is that though the regulations authorize the same activities for the GACs and SEAs, SEAs more often focus on technical assistance type activities. The four activities more often undertaken by SEAs than by other project types include assisting districts in writing proposals, helping districts interpret federal guidelines, obtaining statistical information from school districts, and disseminating materials. The four activities less

often undertaken by SEAs than other project types are more related to content--assisting districts in developing new instructional techniques, developing curricula, training personnel in the use of new methods or materials, and helping districts assess their needs.

One explanation for the difference in emphasis between the GAC and SEA is the host institution link. The SEA differs from the GAC in the sense that it is attached to an institution that has an ongoing relationship with the school districts in its state. Also, the state departments of education are often involved in technical assistance activities in other administrative units, and 44 percent of the SEA Project Directors indicated that their most recent job involved connections with the state departments of education. This close tie to the state department and prior familiarity with the types of activities the state department undertakes, probably inclines Title IV SEA units to focus on technical assistance.

State Education Agencies are more involved in desegregation-related activities than other project types. Thirty-nine percent of SEA Project Directors responded that they assisted districts in developing desegregation plans, compared to 18 percent of GAC Project Directors. Twenty-nine percent of SEA directors indicated that they help districts assess new desegregation capabilities, compared to 4 percent of GAC Project Directors. Finally, 32 percent of SEA directors indicated that they assisted districts in preventing minority dismissal or displacement, compared to 9 percent of GAC Project Directors, 14 percent of TI directors, and 21 percent of dfLEA advisory specialists (Table 3). The data on the last activity are particularly instructive given that the Title IV regulations require SEAs to undertake it, and yet only approximately one-third of all SEAs apparently do so.

In addition, the relative unimportance of organizational characteristics in explaining local-level impacts for SEAs was shown earlier (Table 4). Of the five variables noted, only one is highly correlated with the Summary Index of Impact. This variable is a rating of the degree to which the SEA seemed to be performing the activities that it intended to undertake on its proposed time schedule. Even in this case, the correlation is much weaker than the corresponding correlation for

the GAC. The other four dimensions, which measure the degree to which the SEA has implemented a careful management system and has highly skilled staff, are unrelated to the SEA's performance at the school-district level. Hence, unlike the GAC, project organization characteristics show little relationship to local-level impacts.

Finally, staff characteristics of the GAC were also reviewed; none of the staff or director demographic characteristics show any relationships to activities undertaken at the local level.

In sum, project characteristics seem to show little impact at the local level for SEAs.

IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS

In general, SEA Project Directors report a higher incidence of implementation problems than other project types, and some of those implementation problems have important consequences for the types of assistance SEAs deliver.

State Education Agencies report more difficulty in implementing activities on schedule, and in implementing the activities specified in their proposals, than all other project types. Of the nine specific implementation problems listed in Table 17, SEAs reported a higher incidence of problems in seven.

We can begin to understand why the SEA has difficulty with specific implementation problems when we recall that SEAs are most often involved in delivering technical assistance. Often, this assistance is in response to short-term or emergency needs of their clients. Consequently, staffing requirements are variable. In fact, we can see that SEA staffing requirements are very often underestimated. Furthermore, because the SEAs tend to operate on these short-term or emergency issues, lack of advance information on the district becomes critical. Parental and community opposition could be reported more often by SEA Project Directors because the quick-response mode of operation means that districts call on them to solve immediate local problems, which may be more often characterized by community opposition.

Table 17

IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS--SEA PROFILE

Problem	Project Type			
	SEA	GAC	TI	dfLEA
Reported *more* often by SEAs than other projects[a]				
Loss of staff	44	25	27	10
Underestimating staffing requirements	39	25	17	18
State regulations	39	4	7	0
Federal regulations	28	25	15	3
Lack of advance information on district	19	8	12	(b)
Parental or community opposition	19	0	5	13
Disagreements among project staff	8	0	2	0
Reported *less* often by SEAs than other projects[a]				
Delay in notification of funding	17	58	56	23
Delay or reduction in funding	14	29	46	41
Percent scoring "high" on lack of implementation problems index[c]	61	79	73	64

[a]Percent of Project Directors reporting "yes" to specific problems.

[b]Inappropriate for dfLEA projects.

[c]Percent of Project Directors located in the highest response category for two items: (1) extent to which activities are implemented on schedule; (2) extent to which activities are carried out as specified in proposal.

The problems of lack of advance information and community opposition can interact in an interesting way. In our field work, there was the case of an SEA Project Director who was called in as part of a public relations effort to develop support for a district desegregation plan; his role was to suggest that state backing for the effort existed. However, because he had not had the time to clear his remarks with the local district personnel, he made statements supporting policies that local officials did not want encouraged. The result was that his public appearances ruffled both local policymakers and elements in the community, and he was accused of political insensitivity. Further use of the SEA services was curtailed. The important point is that although his public

statements were not intentionally meant to undercut district officials, his lack of awareness about the specifics of the local situation created opposition to his efforts.

State regulations often create a special set of problems for the SEA. Because the state department of education is an arm of the state government, it is under the jurisdiction of the state's administrative policies and procedures. Consequently, the Title IV SEA members must work within the framework of state regulations. Because of this interconnection, one might hypothesize that certain SEA activities might be seen as state meddling and arouse community opposition.

Table 18 illustrates the relationship between implementation problems and the types of activities undertaken by SEAs. We first notice that loss of staff members and disagreements among staff are both significantly associated with undertaking desegregation-related activities

Table 18

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS AND TYPES OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN

	Type of Activity[a]		
Implementation Problem	Desegregation	Technical Assistance	Training
Loss of staff members (44%)	-.299[b]	.027	.113
Underestimated staffing requirements (39%)	.022	.050[b]	.192
State regulations (39%)	-.073	.296[b]	.073
Federal regulations (28%)	.167	.133	-.158
Lack of advance district information (19%)	-.047	.121	-.037
Parental or community opposition (19%)	.404[c]	.034	-.074
Disagreements among project staff (8%)	-.411[c]	-.106	-.059

[a]Activity clusters were operationalized by selecting a priori activities that were highly correlated with each other and made conceptual sense as being different from other activities. A description of the clusters appears on p. 38.

[b]t_B significant at .05 level.

[c]t_B significant at .001 level.

less frequently. There are several possible explanations for these associations. It may be that undertaking desegregation-related activities lends itself more often to improved staff morale than undertaking technical assistance or training activities. On the other hand, given that desegregation activities are district-specific, these associations might reflect that SEAs that are experiencing staff conflict or loss of staff do not have the requisite manpower to undertake activities requiring staff members to devote time to a single district. If the latter were the case, one would also expect projects that underestimated staffing requirements to be undertaking less desegregation activities. Instead, we see from Table 18 that projects that reported underestimating staff do not report fewer desegregation-related activities. The SEAs that fall in this mode seem to serve as general, all-purpose consultants who respond throughout the grant year to the unanticipated needs of their clients.

Projects that experience problems with state regulations or restrictions report undertaking more technical assistance activities. We were not able to ascertain whether this was an indication that state regulations *prevented* SEAs from undertaking desegregation work more frequently or whether various state regulations required that SEAs do more technical assistance work, such as conducting racial and ethnic surveys and developing guidelines for student rights. Nevertheless, problems with state regulations do tend to result in technical assistance activities being undertaken more frequently.

Table 18 also indicates that experiencing parental or community opposition is more often encountered by SEAs when doing desegregation-related work. Perhaps, desegregation assistance is of the same type as the technical assistance situation mentioned earlier--that the quick-response mode more often involves problems in which community or parental opposition has already occurred. If so, it is the *mode of response*, rather than the type of activity, that is associated with opposition.

It is interesting to note that the same correlation pattern does *not* hold for GACs. One reason for the distinction could be the differences in organizational constraints. Our field work encountered instances where the association of the SEA Title IV units with the state

department and in turn with the district was perceived at the district level as state "interference" in local desegregation efforts. (The GAC is not encumbered by such an association, although the academic aura of university assistance is not always favorably received.) This situation implies that funding SEAs because they represent the force of state legitimacy is not necessarily a good idea; the state association could work as much against the unit at the local level as in its favor. Although there is a distinct separation between the technical assistance and training activities of Title IV and the enforcement activities of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act at the federal level, the separation is not necessarily perceived by client school districts in their interaction with state Title IV units.

In sum, SEA Title IV units report more implementation problems than other project types, and those problems are more often associated with undertaking some types of assistance better than others. Whether the association between greater SEA desegregation-related activities and greater parental or community opposition indicates that SEAs are more often involved in controversial problems, or that SEA activities create community opposition, this finding indicates that circumstances militate against their assistance being perceived as beneficial.

SEA INTERACTIONS WITH OTHER TITLE IV AGENTS, LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

District Interaction Profile

In general, the SEA district interaction profile shows that SEAs tend to direct their activities to administrative core personnel. Tables 12 and 13 (pp. 46 and 47) are based on two kinds of data from the mail questionnaires about district interaction patterns. One measures the planning phase of activity development--the percent of Project Directors reporting whether specific groups of district personnel (such as teachers) were active in making decisions about activities to be undertaken. The second type of data refers to implementation--the percent of Project Directors reporting that activities are or are not frequently directed to specific groups of district personnel. The planning

data show that SEAs are as active in soliciting the assistance of district superintendents as any other project types. However, at the building level, SEAs much less often involve principals and teachers in discussions about which activities are to be undertaken than other project types. At the implementation phase the same pattern appears evident. State Education Agency Project Directors more than any other project administrators report that their activities are virtually tied with GACs in the extent to which activities are directed to district superintendents. Once again, however, participation falls off at the building level; activities are less often directed to principals, teachers, counselors, and school support staff than any other project type.

The SEA procedure for interacting at the district level appears to be the top-down approach, focusing on district administrators. This is consistent with the SEA activity profile, which shows that technical assistance activities more often involve higher-level administrative personnel in school districts, and that the work undertaken in other units of the state department would normally be technical assistance.

Furthermore, Rand interviewers generally rated the depth of administrative contacts lower for SEAs than for other project types. This implies that the SEA is effective in reaching the superintendent but has difficulty penetrating the administrative structure. The nature of these administrative contacts has implications for the SEA's potential for effecting change.

In our earlier discussion of the locus of change at the school district level, we mentioned that change in school desegregation can occur at both the administrative core and the instructional perimeter of the system. Our data analysis indicates that the GAC is primarily involved in promoting change at both the core and the perimeter, whereas the SEA is involved primarily with the core and the TI with the perimeter. The top-down theory of service delivery fits into this discussion in the sense that interacting with top administrative personnel and letting the results of that interaction filter down to lower-level personnel appears to be the actual method of operation for the SEA. Since SEAs are often involved in short-term or emergency problems, there is little

reason to expect that these activities will produce interaction of sufficient depth to promote complete awareness of district problems. This seems to leave the SEA little opportunity for developing district credibility from knowledge of local problems.

There are indications that the SEA emphasis on interaction at the superintendent level can create implementation problems. Table 19 shows

Table 19

ACTIVITY TYPES, BY AUDIENCE

Audience	Type of Activity		
	Desegregation	Technical Assistance	Training
Administrative-level personnel (superintendents, district administrators)	.139	.313[a]	.083
Building-level personnel (principals, teachers, counselors)	.249[a]	.124	.367[b]
Community-level personnel (parents, students)	.121	.400[c]	.268

[a] t_B significant at the .05 level.
[b] t_B significant at the .01 level.
[c] t_B significant at the .001 level.

that technical assistance activities are more often directed to the community level, in this case defined as parents and students, as well as administrative personnel. (Activities in this group include acquiring statistical information for school districts, and this can involve community participation.) Desegregation and training activities for SEAs tend to be directed to school-level personnel. As mentioned earlier, SEAs less often involve the school and community levels in the planning stages of activity preparation but tend to involve administrative personnel more often. This would imply that SEA activities are undertaken from the perspective of the top administrative level. A disparity occurs, then, between the level of personnel involved in planning and the level involved in implementation. Since the agendas of the administration are

not necessarily those held by school-level personnel, SEA activities directed to school-level personnel may not be sensitive to their needs. This disjunction does not occur with any other project type.

Comparison of SEA Interactions at the Federal, State, and District Levels

Table 20 reports on the correlation between the types of activities undertaken by a SEA and the level of personnel who are actively involved in planning. In general, participation in planning has little effect on the types of activities frequently undertaken by SEAs. This is particularly interesting with regard to desegregation-related activities and stands in contrast to the GAC. The one significant correlation is between regional office participation in planning technical assistance activities. That is, the more often USOE regional office and federal-level personnel participate in the decision about what activities SEAs undertake, the more often SEAs undertake technical assistance activities (i.e., assisting districts in proposal-writing activity, developing and disseminating materials, obtaining statistical information from school districts, and maintaining research libraries).

Table 20

ACTIVITY TYPES BY PERSONNEL LEVELS INVOLVED IN PLANNING[a]

Personnel Level	Type of Activity		
	Desegregation	Technical Assistance	Training
Federal (USOE regional and national)	-.089	.366[b]	-.042
State (CSSO[c], other SEA personnel)	-.017	.141	.145
District (superintendents, principals, teachers, etc.)	.153	.272	-.074

[a]Percentage of Project Directors reporting how often each group participates in the decision about what activities will be undertaken.

[b]t_B significant at the .01 level.

[c]Chief state school officer.

One example of this relationship was shown in our field work. Many of the SEA project offices that we visited were involved in helping the regional office to monitor ESAA activities in the districts. The regional office felt that this was a valuable activity for them to undertake. It served to provide a method of entry into the district, which the regional office felt could then be used to assist the district in other desegregation-related problems they may be having. However, since regional office participation in planning is not correlated with an SEA's frequently undertaking desegregation kinds of activities, SEAs are not apparently experiencing the spillover between ESAA monitoring and undertaking other desegregation activities. Districts being helped by ESAA that we visited, which were being monitored by the SEA, accurately saw the SEA as undertaking ESAA monitoring at the request of the regional office--in other words, they felt that the SEA was functioning as an arm of the regional office. One district in particular was very blunt in its assessment of this relationship and regarded the SEA as ineffective. This district, in turn, circumvented the SEA Title IV unit completely and went directly to the regional office whenever they needed certain kinds of information, such as guideline interpretations. As a result, this SEA unit, and perhaps others as well, was caught in a bind between using ESAA as a method of entry into districts but as a result being viewed by the districts as a passive organization.

Of course, ESAA monitoring is but a single example of how technical assistance activities are planned with the assistance of federal-level personnel. The important point is that there is no federal thrust for the SEA to become involved in desegregation-related activities. The data seem to indicate that regional office involvement in SEA planning encourages the technical assistance mode of operation.

Table 21 relates the extent of support for activities by personnel level to types of activities undertaken by SEAs. One of the most important correlations in this table is that between support by state-level personnel and desegregation-related activities. This would indicate that *when* desegregation-related activities more frequently occur, they do so with higher levels of support from the state. This correlation confirms several observations made by our interviewers in the field. In the

Table 21

ACTIVITY TYPES BY EXTENT OF SUPPORT FROM VARIOUS PERSONNEL LEVELS[a]

Personnel Level	Type of Activity		
	Desegregation	Technical Assistance	Training
Federal	.086	.149	.382[b]
State	.389[b]	.170	.185
Own staff	-.027	.279[c]	.081
District	.083	.117	.172

[a]Project Directors reporting level of support from specific personnel in carrying out their program.

[b]t_B significant at the .01 level.

[c]t_B significant at the .05 level.

course of our field work, most of the 13 SEA Title IV units we visited showed little evidence of state commitment to desegregation, whereas others had no firm means of operationalizing their avowals of commitment. Four of the SEAs we visited were operating in states that had mandated desegregation. In two of these cases, however, the formal mandate was not accompanied by stated goals and objectives; in the other two cases, the state mandates were accompanied by not only stated goals and objectives but also by a time frame in which desegregation was to be accomplished. In the latter two states, the state Title IV units were able to pursue desegregation activities more aggressively. We feel this means that state commitment and follow-through is a necessary condition for the SEA Title IV unit to engage in effective service delivery of desegregation activities. What we could not ascertain was whether state commitment itself was a *sufficient* condition. That is, without a state Title IV unit would that state persist in promoting desegregation-related activities anyway? If such were the case, then there would be no need to fund Title IV SEAs under conditions of high state commitment either, since the states would find other funds to implement their policies.

We previously indicated that state support was essential for SEAs to do more specifically related desegregation work. Yet, SEA Project Directors report the lowest level of support in carrying out their program from personnel at their own host institutions and from their own project staff. Forty-seven percent of all SEA Project Directors report "receiving a great deal of support" from state personnel, as compared to 71 percent of GAC directors and 78 percent of TI directors reporting they receive a great deal of support from personnel at their university or college. Hence, the data indicate that SEA directors in general do not perceive the levels of support necessary to encourage desegregation work generally.

In addition, 78 percent of SEA directors indicate that they receive a great deal of support in carrying out their programs from their own staffs. This compares with 100 percent of GAC directors and 95 percent of TI directors.

Combining the necessity for state-level support with less than a 50 percent change of obtaining it points out the high-risk nature of SEA grants.

SEA District-Level Impacts

Since each project type--GAC, SEA, TI, or dfLEA--has different objectives, by necessity the district-level impacts cannot be measured in the same way for all agencies. The three areas which seem appropriate as measures for the SEA include personnel selection impacts, district program and/or policy impacts, and institutional impacts. Table 22 reports the mean scores on those interviewer rating variables for each of the four project types. The small number of sites visited militates against the probability of finding statistically significant differences. Nevertheless, the results are interesting. Of the three variables listed, the SEA shows its largest impact on personnel selection relative to the other project types. In the course of our field work, our interviewers were impressed with the recruitment efforts of the SEA Title IV units, specifically as they related to minority personnel. In one specific case, the SEA Project Director was responsible for recommending two assistant superintendents to those districts visited.

Table 22

DISTRICT-LEVEL IMPACTS--SEA PROFILE[a]

Area of Impact	Project Type			
	SEA	GAC	TI	dfLEA
Personnel selection[b]	3.43	2.36	3.00	2.60
District program or policy[c]	3.11	3.30	2.83	3.14
Institutional impacts[d]	2.44	2.25	2.60	2.70

[a]Mean scores on interviewer rating variables; range 1-6, with 6 being high.

[b]Includes whether the Title IV project has a discernible effect on personnel recruitment and attempts to recruit other personnel outside the local district.

[c]Includes whether the Title IV project has a discernible effect on district programs or policies.

[d]Includes the Title IV project involving the community in the district's desegregation effort, facilitating the community's access to the district's formal structure, and altering the district's routine procedures, loci of decisionmaking, and the roles of individual actors within the district.

State Education Agencies assist personnel selection at the district level by providing superintendents and other administrators with recruitment sources that often extend beyond state borders, to national networks. This is particularly the case when the SEA director is minority but this is not always a necessary condition. When district superintendents are looking for qualified minorities, the SEA can be extremely useful as a means of casting a wider net for candidates.

Finally, SEAs show the highest incidence of overlap with other project types and seem to be the natural organization to handle coordinating efforts between Title IV projects. Fifty-six percent of SEA directors repeated the same activities conducted by another Title IV project, compared to 41 percent of GAC directors and 14 percent of TI directors. Probably because of the SEA's emphasis on technical assistance activities, the same subject matter is less often reported as a source of overlap by SEAs than the *same school districts*. Of those SEAs reporting that the

same activities were conducted by another Title IV project type, 84 percent indicated that these activities occurred in the same school districts, as opposed to 45 percent for GACs and 20 percent for TIs. Thus, even without concerted efforts on the part of SEAs to communicate with other project types they more often encounter them. These data indicate that the SEA Title IV unit seems to be a particularly appropriate agency through which Title IV activities could be coordinated if a single agency were to be selected.

SUMMARY

State Education Agencies tend to focus on technical assistance activities, and their district interaction profile reflects the top-down method of operations. The depth of interaction at the administrative level was not rated high by our interviewers, which implies that the SEA Project Director can contact the superintendent but has difficulty penetrating the administrative structure. In addition, since SEAs are primarily involved in responsive technical assistance activities, there is little reason to expect that these activities will allow the type of interaction of sufficient depth to promote thorough knowledge of local-level problems, and which in turn can develop a great deal of district credibility for SEAs. In addition, there appears to be disjunction between planning at the administrative level and targeting perimeter. Implementation problems can arise, since activities undertaken from the perspective of the top administrative level can create friction both with the recipients and with the superintendent. Hence, the incentive for SEA Project Directors seems to be to maintain the technical assistance mode of operation.

State Education Agencies report more implementation problems than other project types, and these implementation problems constrain the types of assistance SEAs can deliver.

Federal-level involvement in SEA planning tends to encourage the technical assistance mode; this contrasts with the GAC. State-level support in carrying out its program is associated with SEAs undertaking desegregation-related activities more often. We feel this means that state commitment is a necessary condition for effective service delivery

for SEAs, but we could not ascertain whether it was a sufficient condition, i.e., whether a state sufficiently committed to a goal of school desegregation would undertake to assist districts with their desegregation-related problems regardless of whether an SEA Title IV unit existed or not. Yet, SEA directors report the lowest levels of support from their host institutions, which implies that SEA directors are not, in general, receiving the support enabling them to undertake desegregation activities more often. This result was substantiated by our field work; two out of the thirteen SEAs visited evidenced an operational commitment to desegregation, and those were judged by our interviewers as the most effective Title IV SEAs, no matter which measure of effectiveness was used.

Finally, SEAs generally were judged to be the most effective project types in the area of personnel selection, and they seem to be the logical agency to coordinate Title IV efforts since they more often than other project types interacted with the same districts.

V. TRAINING INSTITUTES

Section 404 of Title IV authorizes grants to institutes of higher education for the operation of short-term institutes to train school personnel to deal with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation.

The TI is usually located in a teachers college near the small number of districts being served. In FY75, grants were awarded to 47 institutes; the average grant size was $93,426. Training Institutes serve an average of 9 school districts, which are close together geographically, and have 6 full-time and part-time staff on the average. (Unlike the other project types, the TI is primarily staffed with part-time personnel; on the average, 4 out of 6 staff persons are part-time.) Both the Project Director and staff tend to be younger than in other project types, and TI directors are second only to the GAC in percentage of Ed.D. or Ph.D. degrees held. The GAC Project Director, however, is more likely to be a minority, whereas the TI staffs generally have a larger minority component than GACs (see Table 6).

Mail questionnaires were sent to each of the TI Project Directors, with 41 of the 47 responding (87 percent). In addition, 6 TIs and 8 of their client school districts were visited on-site by Rand personnel for supplementary information. This section presents the major findings from the data analysis on the mail questionnaires and case study material from the site visits.

We will begin this section of the report with a discussion of project characteristics and continue in the same format as the other sections. Training Institutes will be compared primarily to the GACs, since they are both involved in similar activities and approaches and are both located at institutions of higher education.

PROJECT OFFICE CHARACTERISTICS

Activity Profile

Title IV legislation limits institutes to training activities related to problems occasioned by desegregation. Table 23 is an

Table 23

TRAINING INSTITUTE ACTIVITY PROFILE

Activity	Most Frequently[a]
Hold institutes to train school personnel in use of new methods/materials	85
Develop new instructional techniques	80
Hold institutes to sensitize pupil-contact personnel to environment of desegregated school	71
Systematically contact institute participants after they return to their districts	68
Develop curricula	63
Work with institute participants as they conduct their own training	56
	Less Frequently[a]
Develop new administration structures	26
Help districts formulate plans to prevent dismissal or displacement of minority personnel	14
Help districts cope with crises	13

[a]Percent of Project Directors responding to mail questionnaires concerning activities undertaken "most frequently" or "less frequently."

illustration of the TI activity profile. Comparing the TI's activity profile with those discussed earlier, we see that the TIs do in fact play a more specific role than either the GAC or the SEA. They do not seem to be general, all-purpose desegregation resources to the client as the GAC and SEA often are. The TI activity profile shows a more specific thrust than the other project types. The activities least often undertaken are both more specifically desegregation-related (helping districts prevent minority dismissal or displacement) and aimed more at technical assistance (helping districts develop new administrative procedures).

However, the TI activity profile changes with longer-term funding; the training emphasis is replaced by technical assistance. The data in

Table 24 indicate that TIs that exist for longer periods* tend to provide less training of school personnel in the use of new methods or materials and more assistance to districts in dealing with racial conflict among students and helping districts cope with crises--short-range problems apparently further removed from the training emphases of TIs stressed in the regulations.

Table 24

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LENGTH OF PROJECT AND ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN

Activity	Length of Service of Director	Years Project Funded
Train in use of new methods/materials	-.143	-.155
Develop new instructional techniques	.124	.097
Develop curricula	.180	.015
Observe participants in their classrooms	.248[a]	.031
Train personnel to conduct similar programs	.020	-.103
Help districts deal with racial conflict among students	.416[b]	.314[c]
Help districts cope with crises	.305[a]	.253

[a] t_B significant at .01 level.

[b] t_B significant at .001 level.

[c] t_B significant at .05 level.

Management and Staffing

Unlike the GAC, the TI does not rely on extensive management plans throughout the year. The reasons for this appear to be twofold: First, the small staff of the typical TI makes extensive management plans unnecessary. Second, the average number of client school districts is substantially smaller than for the GAC (9 versus 98) and consequently requires fewer staff members and less organization to get the job done. An additional distinction between the TI and the GAC is the timing of

*As measured by either the length of service of the TI director or the number of years the TI is funded.

their service to the client districts. Sixty-eight percent of the TI Project Directors indicated that they held workshops during the summer, whereas GACs indicated that the bulk of their services were provided during the academic year. Both project types find it necessary to utilize management strategies that are effective for the duration of contact with their clients. For the TI this means front-end planning, since that is when the bulk of their activity takes place, and a heavy reliance on part-time staff as compared to the GAC. As indicated above, the TI's most labor-intensive period is during the conduct of its institute. Upon completion of the institute, the TI tends to reduce its contact with its client (only 45 percent of TI Project Directors reported workshop contact after the main institute was held). Thus, the majority of TI staff members are recruited only for the duration of the proposed institute, i.e., on a part-time basis.

Table 6 listed the personnel characteristics for each project type. There is not much variation in characteristics across project types. Both the TI and the GAC are staffed and directed primarily by men. The staffs of both project types have essentially the same level of school system and desegregation experience. However, TI staffs tend to have more human relations training and are composed of more minority group members. Project Directors of TIs are less often minority than GAC directors.

Table 25 shows the relationship of staff and director experience to activities undertaken; the profile is the same as for the GAC and SEA; with a few exceptions there is no relationship. We hypothesized about the reasons for this in the previous section on GACs.

Implementation Problems

Delay or reduction in funding is a relatively greater problem for TIs than other project types. Forty-six percent of TI Project Directors report this to be a problem, compared to 29 percent of GACs and 14 percent of SEAs. Training Institutes often schedule their institutes in the summer, resulting in a very labor-intensive first part of the grant year. Any delay in funding, or, for that matter, delay in notification, would severely restrict their ability to implement the planned program

Table 25

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STAFF AND PROJECT DIRECTOR EXPERIENCE AND ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN

Activity	Staff Human Relations Training	Staff School System Experience	Director Desegregation Experience
Train in use of new methods/materials	-.155	-.169	-.329[a]
Develop new instructional techniques	-.114	.270	.024
Develop curricula	-.446[b]	-.057	.159
Observe participants in their classrooms	-.231	-.035	-.254
Train personnel to conduct similar programs	-.101	-.198	-.081
Help districts deal with racial conflict among students	.020	-.081	.087
Help districts cope with crises	-.068	.007	-.214

[a] t_B significant at .05 level.

[b] t_B significant at .001 level.

with as much speed as the schedule requires. Teaching Institutes must finalize staff, prepare the institute (content, physical location, consultants, and other administrative matters such as the amount of academic credit and stipends), and recruit district participants--all in a very short time. Even a few weeks delay might have severe implications for the success of the institute.

However, TIs experience the problem of changing district needs the least often of all project types. Twenty-four percent of TI directors report this to be a problem, compared to 43 percent of GACs and 42 percent of SEAs. Client school districts request assistance in a specific problem area and agree to participate in a specific, mutually agreed upon program. Because the clients are given the opportunity to select the TI's service and have specified their needs, there is little problem with changing district needs. General Assistance Centers, on the

other hand, provide a general list of authorized activities. In the course of the school year, as unanticipated needs arise, the clients request new or additional services from the GAC.

Additional interviewer rating data provide support for the argument that TIs encounter a minimum amount of dissonance between their needs and their client school districts. When asked to rate the disparity between perspectives of the district and the project on an index of 1 to 6 (1 = none, 6 = great deal), interviewers rated TI projects as having the least disparity (a mean rating of 1.8 versus 2.6 for GACs and 2.5 for SEAs).

Our field work identified another implementation problem. Training Institute participants are expected to participate as trainers when they return to their schools (according to the regulations), but the general lack of follow-up often makes participants in a one-shot intensive training session not feel competent enough to become trainers themselves. In our field work we found that quite often the participants of an institute's workshops found the new information to be useful in terms of their own specific job but did not feel confident about training others in the methods they had recently learned. It is not surprising that institute participants, not usually involved in training peers in the course of their normal work day, would find a short-term institute with no follow-up insufficient preparation for taking on additional work responsibilities. In the field we found that TIs often spend the bulk of their money on intensive training sessions with little follow-up, which alone do not usually instill in the participants a feeling of sufficient competence for them to feel comfortable in training others.

Currently, follow-up activities are included under the general heading of "activities" in the TI program announcements. While there is verbal affirmation of the importance of follow-up, there are no point criteria included in the award process to specifically ensure it, or to assure that the institute participants attend. Projects are left to their own devices when dividing up their resources by activity and, as a result, there appears to be no systematic approach used by TIs to develop training capacity in the client. Instead, participants are

provided with intensive and sometimes extensive training and are then left to their own devices with little systematic contact with the project.

In only one case in our field work was follow-up given high priority. In that instance, the Project Director and assistant Project Director made weekly visits to the schools in the district to deal with problems the institute participants faced in incorporating the newly taught strategies into their work routine. This project was able to provide year-long consultation service resulting in increased confidence and competence of the participants. In fact, several of the participants were beginning to take on training responsibilities and the institute was starting to have the desired effect in its client district.

Training Institutes report a closer relationship to their host institutions and function less as independent organizations than do GACs. They consistently report a more active involvement with their university in planning their project activities and implementing their Title IV work in their host institution. Forty-two percent of TI directors report that their institution is actively involved in planning project activities, compared to 12 percent of GAC directors. Forty-nine percent of TI directors report that the education department widely adopts the Title IV project's materials or techniques, compared to 29 percent of GAC directors. Eighty-six percent of TI directors report teaching courses in their department, compared to 10 percent of GAC directors. Also, TI directors and staff more often report teaching courses based on Title IV than do GAC directors and staff.

In part, this difference in the relationship between GACs and TIs and their host institution can be explained by the types of activities these two project types undertake. The activities undertaken by TIs are in many respects more traditional activities for schools of education. The activities undertaken frequently by GACs, however, include helping districts assess their needs, developing techniques for school/community interaction, and developing new administrative procedures--activities that cannot necessarily be regarded as traditional activities for an education department to undertake.

Also, staff recruitment is different for TIs and GACs. From the site visits, we concluded that TIs generally recruit staff members from the teaching ranks of the university or college at which they are located. Training Institute Project Directors, according to mail questionnaire data, are more likely than GAC directors to be recruited from other positions at the home institution (55 percent versus 42 percent). This recruitment policy could reinforce the close working relationship TIs have with their host institutions and encourage them to function less autonomously than GACs.

Finally, the scheduling of activities for TIs and GACs creates a different staff structure. The most labor-intensive aspect of a TI's program tends to be sessions held for a number of weeks over the summer months. During the school year, TIs may conduct follow-up activities and additional training during shorter periods. These activities do not require a large or full-time staff. As a result, during the school year most of the TI staff members have a full-time job in addition to any continued participation in institute activities. Our field contacts substantiated this picture of the TI. For example, one project held a six-week summer institute staffed by approximately four university professors and several outside consultants. At the end of the six weeks, the staff was reduced to the director and assistant director. Their involvement was at a one-half time level throughout the rest of the year. Once the institute was over, there was a weekly follow-up in the client district, for which there was no need for the entire institute staff. Thus the TI appears as an organization in which staff operate as university teachers, sometimes within the university and at other times within the TI. The TI does not seem to have the kind of institutional or organizational life as the GAC, which operates at a more constant level throughout the year.

District Interaction Patterns

In our field work we found that the connection with the school of education often served to provide an easy, nonthreatening introduction with the client school district for the TI. In several cases, either the superintendent or principal in a participating district or school

was either a graduate or student in the school of education in which the TI was located.

Besides ready availability, the TI has other inducements to offer school districts. Seventy-five percent of the TIs give participants the option of receiving academic credit for attending the institute, and 72 percent of these participants elect to receive the credit. Receiving academic credit provides added motivation for participation because it allows participants to advance professionally while gaining expertise from the institute sessions (additional hours of credit often provide advancement on the salary scale). Furthermore, the TI method of planning which activities to undertake shows the district-oriented basis of its operations.

Project Directors of GACs and TIs were asked to respond to a series of questions about the method they used for deciding which activities their project would undertake. General Assistance Center directors more often responded (55 percent to 21 percent) that they provided districts with a list of all activities authorized under Title IV and asked districts to indicate which ones they would like to receive. Teaching Institute directors more often responded (62 percent to 41 percent) that they asked districts to identify activities they would *like* to receive from their project and then planned to offer those activities identified that were authorized under Title IV. In other words, GACs more often used a procedure which would enable them to establish an organization-based approach to service delivery, one with a limited set of alternatives for districts to respond to so that the organization could develop a consistent response capacity over a period of time. On the other hand, TIs permitted the district to identify any activity they wanted and then ascertained whether it was authorized. This procedure allows districts to decide how the TI will be used and structured, since the activity list is constructed from the perceived needs of districts rather than from a list of authorized activities. This procedure seems to establish a good working relationship between institutes and districts at the preproposal stage and minimizes problems in implementation. However, this method of organizing for service delivery also implies that TIs will less often develop long-range goals or function as service agencies independent of the school districts they serve.

In general, TIs plan their activities with administrative-core-level district personnel on an as-needed basis and target their activities more often to the instructional perimeter of the system than other project types. The activity profile of TIs, mentioned earlier, indicates that they are most often involved with pupil contact personnel. Consequently, they should involve teachers in the planning of their activities to ensure appropriate targeting. According to Table 12 (p. 76), TIs involve teachers in the planning of their activities to a greater extent than do GACs (60 percent versus 38 percent), although both the TI and GAC report involving superintendents and principals in *planning* with nearly the same frequency.

The differences between the GAC and TI emerge in the targeted populations for their activities. Although GACs and TIs aim their services at principals, teachers, etc., with almost the same frequency, TIs do not provide services to administrative personnel as often as GACs. Only 39 percent of the TIs directed any of their activities to superintendents, compared with 88 percent of GACs. Only 42 percent of the TIs directed any of their activities to district administrators other than superintendents, compared with 83 percent of GACs. The following approach to service delivery emerges: TIs utilize the administrative core of the system (superintendents and administrators) to garner support from and participation of the instructional perimeter (principals, teachers, other pupil contact personnel). On the other hand, GACs use the administrative core for support of their program and target both the instructional perimeter and the administrative core with almost the same frequency.

SUMMARY

Teaching Institutes show a more specific activity profile emphasizing activities relating to the special training of school personnel, although the training emphasis can be replaced by technical assistance the longer a TI is funded. They do not operate as organizations independent from their host institutions and essentially structure themselves to meet specific district needs; in some respects TIs operate as arms of the school districts they serve. Since institutes plan with

administrative personnel to build support for their activities, and target their activities more often to instructional personnel, they must rely on instructional participants who are committed to change to influence administrators to change district policy. Finally, consistent follow-up procedures would help institute participants to act as trainers when they return to the classroom.

VI. DIRECT-FUNDED LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

The dfLEA represents an application of internal change agent theory to Title IV. Unlike the GAC, SEA, or TI, which all focus on institutional change as encouraged by an external service agency, the provision for direct grants through Title IV enables the district to directly hire a desegregation specialist and, in some cases, the grant also provides for desegregation-related in-service training.

The dfLEA grant is the smallest in size of any Title IV project type. In FY75, 52 dfLEAs were operating; the average grant size was $35,700. Only 51 percent of the dfLEA Project Directors (also called desegregation or advisory specialists) reported having any staff members in addition to themselves. Among these 51 percent, the average number of additional full-time staff was 1.6. The characteristics of these staff members and the dfLEA directors were discussed in Sec. III and outlined in Table 8, p. 41. Staff members of dfLEAs more often than the other project types are minorities with prior school system experience and less human relations training. Slightly over one-half of the dfLEA Project Directors are minority group members and one-third are women. Ninety-five percent report working in a school district prior to assuming their present position, and 83 percent report having been teachers at some time. On the average, the advisory specialists have worked in their present school district for 7.6 years and are recruited from within the district from administrative or teaching positions. This suggests that a dfLEA appointment may be related to the achievement of district affirmative action goals.

Mail questionnaires were sent to each of the dfLEA Project Directors, with 39 of the 52 responding (75 percent). In addition, 9 dfLEAs were visited in person by Rand staff to obtain supplementary materials. This section presents the major findings from an analysis based on both data sources.

Unlike the previous sections, which describe the GAC, SEA, and TI by comparing them to other project offices, the dfLEA will not specifically be compared to any other project type, since it is the only Title

IV project to provide direct assistance. This section will begin with a discussion of dfLEA project characteristics, including the activities they undertake, and will continue with a discussion of the relationship between the dfLEA and its host district.

PROJECT OFFICE CHARACTERISTICS

The dfLEA activity profile (Tables 26 and 27) varies according to the stage of desegregation of the school district. By stage of

Table 26

DFLEA ACTIVITY PROFILE

Activity	Most Frequently[a]
Human relations training with teachers	68
Helping superintendent to formulate or implement desegregation plan	64
Developing programs to improve school/community interaction	63
Coordinating Title IV with other federal programs	56
Helping schools assess their desegregation-related needs	53
Human relations training with administrators	50
	Least Frequently[a]
Working with students	24
Ensuring that minority school personnel are not demoted or dismissed	21
Assisting teachers in experiencing actual interracial classroom situations	18
Human relations training with support staff	16
Arranging for school personnel to visit other desegregated school systems	0

[a]Percent of Project Directors responding that activity is undertaken "most frequently" or "least frequently."

desegregation we mean whether the district reports itself as presently *developing* a desegregation plan, in the *processing of implementing* a desegregation plan, or has *completed the implementation* of a desegretation plan. Nineteen percent of dfLEA Project Directors reported that

Table 27

DFLEA ACTIVITY PROFILE BY STAGE OF DESEGREGATION

Activity[a]	Developing Desegregation Plan	Implementing Desegregation Plan	Completed Implementation of Desegregation Plan
Human relations training for teachers	75	61	60
Human relations training for administrators	63	50	33
Human relations training for support staff	25	11	13
Helping superintendent formulate or implement desegregation plan	63	78	33
Helping schools assess needs	13	67	40
Developing programs to improve school/community relations	38	50	27
Attending community meetings to explain plan	13	28	7
Helping teachers get practical desegregated classroom experience	13	22	20
Helping prevent minority dismissal or displacement	38	50	67
Coordinating Title IV with other federal programs	38	50	67
Training in use of new methods/techniques	13	28	47
Working with student leaders	13	22	27

[a]Percent of Project Directors responding that activity is undertaken "most frequently."

their district was presently developing a plan, 44 percent were in the process of implementing, and 36 percent had completed implementation of their plan. Projects in districts that are in the first stage of desegregation primarily conduct human relations training with pupil contact personnel and district administrators. In these cases, Title IV funds are being used to "ready" school staffs for desegregation by improving staff attitudes and awareness.

Projects in districts that are in the second stage of desegregation--implementing a desegregation plan--engage in a different set of activities. For example, dfLEA projects at this stage tend to focus on community interaction more than they do at other stages. Over 50 percent of these Project Directors report attending community meetings to explain the district's desegregation plan and developing programs geared towards improving school/community relations. This focus on school/community relations is of critical importance during the implementation stage. Other activities frequently undertaken by dfLEAs during this period include helping schools to assess needs that may arise under these new circumstances, helping teachers to get practical experience prior to their assignment to a desegregated classroom, and helping to ensure that minority personnel are not demoted or dismissed as a result of implementing the desegregation plan. What these activities have in common is the fact that they are initiated in response to the anticipation of problems occasioned by the desegregation efforts.

Once districts have completed the implementation of their desegregation plan, dfLEAs tend once again to be involved in a different set of activities. Project Directors in this phase frequently report coordinating Title IV with other federal programs, an indication that they are more likely than districts in earlier stages to receive desegregation funds from other federal programs. In fact, of the dfLEAs who report having completed the implementation of their desegregation plan, 100 percent of them also report receiving additional funds to meet their desegregation needs as compared to 81 percent of the dfLEAs who are in the process of implementing their plan and 57 percent of the dfLEAs who are presently developing a plan. Once the district has completed implementation of its plan, the dfLEA Project Directors are also more likely

to report working with student leaders and training teachers in the use of new instructional methods. These activities tend to indicate that once districts have completed implementation of their desegregation plan they are likely to use Title IV and funds received from other sources for activities that could be regarded as typical compensatory education or ESAA-type activities (training in use of new methods/materials and direct services to students).

In addition to the activity profile, Table 28 shows that the reasons for applying for Title IV grants vary depending on the district's

Table 28

REASONS FOR APPLYING FOR TITLE IV LFLEA GRANT[a]

Stages of Desegregation	Needed Additional Funds	To Have Full-Time Services on Site	To Try Innovative Approach	To Extend ESAA
Developing desegregation plan	17	43	57	71
Implementing desegregation plan	25	50	38	44
Completed implementation of desegregation plan	54	54	69	85

[a]Percent of Project Directors responding "yes."

stage of desegregation. Direct-funded LEAs in districts that are presently developing a plan cite the need for additional funds and their desire to extend ESAA services as their two primary reasons for seeking Title IV funds. While these districts are the least likely to receive an ESAA grant (14 percent as compared to 63 percent of the districts presently implementing a plan and 69 percent of the districts that have completed implementation), they see themselves in need of additional funds to assist desegregation. At this stage in a district's desegregation effort, the issue may be potentially too sensitive for the district to visibly commit itself to desegregation by committing a sizable portion of district funds. Planning desegregation activities using

district funds could be an obvious political target if those funds were diverted from elsewhere in the typically overextended district budget.

By the time districts are in the process of implementing their plan, they are visibly committed and may find it easier to earmark district money to promote desegregation. However, at this stage the districts are faced with the day-to-day problems of implementing the plan and more often report applying for a Title IV grant to have the full-time services of a person on-site to handle those problems. Districts in this stage, however, are less apt to apply for Title IV funds as a means of trying an innovative approach or of extending ESAA services, even though they are likely to receive an ESAA grant.

Districts that have completed the implementation of their desegregation plan appear more likely to view Title IV as fitting into their overall desegregation framework. At this stage they appear to want to institutionalize the role of the advisory specialist to extend desegregation-related services and continue implementing new approaches. Our field visits suggest that the advisory specialist at this point has become a fixture in the district administration.

Staffing

As Table 29 shows, most desegregation specialists do not feel that they have a great deal of influence on district operations related to desegregation. Only 38 percent of all advisory specialists report a

Table 29

INFLUENCE OF DFLEA DIRECTORS OVER DISTRICT OPERATIONS

District Operation	Percent Reporting "A Great Deal"	Percent Reporting "Some"	Percent Reporting "None"
Method of school desegregation	38	33	28
Timetable for school desegregation	29	32	39
School site selection	29	36	51
Personnel selection	15	64	20
Budgeting	10	44	46

great deal of influence in deciding upon the method of school desegregation, 29 percent report a great deal of influence on the timetable for school desegregation or the selection of specific schools. Personnel selection and budgeting matters are the least often perceived areas of influence (15 percent and 10 percent, respectively).

Nevertheless, over two-thirds of all advisory specialists report supervisory or administrative responsibilities in addition to their Title IV positions (Table 30), and these other duties could serve as

Table 30

DFLEA DIRECTOR'S OTHER DUTIES

Percent reporting having other duties	68
Percent of additional duties mentioned:	
School district administration	64
Administering or working on other federal programs such as ESEA	56
Administering or working on ESAA	36
Teaching or counseling	20

an additional source of power in terms of the activities the advisory specialist undertakes related to desegregation. Also, 85 percent of the advisory specialists report meeting with the superintendent three or more times during the first six months of the Title IV project, so access to the superintendent does not appear to be a problem. Yet, the generally low perception of their own power reported by advisory specialists implies that the position operates within the school administration more as a staff than a line function and hence the authority for making desegregation-related decisions is not necessarily there.

Table 31 shows the correlation between various district characteristics and the perceived influence of the advisory specialist. Superintendent and district commitment to desegregation are positively associated with advisory specialists' perception of greater influence in desegregation matters.

The advisory specialist derives influence from two sources: from the superintendent and from his or her role as desegregation specialist in the district. The data show that the greater the frequency of contact

Table 31

DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS AFFECTING PERCEIVED INFLUENCE OF ADVISORY SPECIALIST

District Characteristic	Amount of Influence Perceived by Advisory Specialist
Number of years since district implemented desegregation plan	.293[a]
Contact with superintendent	.329
Number of desegregation activities undertaken by superintendent	.203
Number of years advisory specialist worked in school district	.188
Number of years as dfLEA Project Director	.181
Specialist's previous school system experience	.177
Specialist's previous experience in a desegregation school system	-.049

[a] t_B significant at .01 level.

with the superintendent, through meetings, written communication, or verbal communication, the more influence the advisory specialist perceived. Frequent contact with the superintendent serves several purposes: It prevents the advisory specialist from operating in a vacuum and demonstrates to both the specialist and other district personnel that the specialist has the support of the front office. Also, the more active role the superintendent took regarding desegregation (as measured by the number of desegregation activities undertaken) the more influence the advisory specialist perceived. Finally, the longer a district has been desegregated, the more influence perceived, i.e., the more amenable the environment is for desegregation-related activities. These data are confirmed by our site visits.

In our field visits, we found that those advisory specialists who received the most support from their districts and were located in districts with a high level of commitment to desegregation seemed to be having the most impact on the desegregation efforts of their districts. Conversely, in those districts where superintendent commitment was rated

low and the degree of district support was not clear, the Title IV efforts seemed fractionated, and it was difficult to identify participants or impacts on the district. For example, in one of our sampled districts the dfLEA was due to implement a desegregation plan in September 1975. The advisory specialist had little input into the design of that plan and no direct involvement prior to its implementation. He was relatively isolated from the superintendent and most of the district's administrative hierarchy. It was difficult for the participants to identify the effect of his services. Additionally, he was a new employee of the school district, although he had been involved in the community at large in related efforts for several years. It was his impression that a major source of the frustration he articulated about his ineffectiveness stemmed from his isolation from the district administration. Our interviewers inferred that this lack of support was partly the result of his short tenure, which made him an "outsider" in the district bureaucracy.

On the other hand, another of our sampled districts was also facing a desegregation implementation for the coming school year. In this case the advisory specialist was directly involved with both the administrative staff and the instructional staff and indicated that he had open access to school campuses and any administrator's office. He accompanied our interviewers to a school campus and the students greeted him enthusiastically. He was a long-time employee of the district and had "moved" through the district staff as a teacher, consultant, assistant principal, and presently, Title IV coordinator. This example indicates that the advisory specialist is being used to supplement the role of the superintendent in desegregation by being active in areas in which the superintendent frequently does not usually get involved--building community support and working with students.

Implementation Problems

Budget cuts are more often a problem for dfLEAs than for other project types; two-thirds of projects report receiving a cut in their proposed budget. Those projects that experienced a cut received an average of only 49 percent of the funds requested. Advisory specialists tend to respond to these budget cuts by eliminating specific activities (72

percent), reducing staff or staff time (56 percent), and reducing the purchase of equipment or materials (44 percent). As Table 32 shows,

Table 32

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DFLEA BUDGET CUTS AND TYPES OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN

Ways Project Cut	Type of Activity[a]	
	Desegregation Planning	Human Relations Training
Specific activities eliminated	-.286[b]	.020
Staff or staff time reduced	-.364[c]	-.082
Funding for some activities reduced	-.123	.151

[a]Activity clusters were operationalized by selecting a priori activities that were highly correlated with each other and made conceptual sense as being different from other activities. As a result, the following clusters were identified for the dfLEA projects. *Desegregation planning*: helping superintendent formulate or implement desegregation plan; *human relations training*: providing human relations training to administrators, teachers, and support staff.

[b]t_B significant at .05 level.

[c]t_B significant at .01 level.

budget cuts seem to hinder a superintendent from formulating or implementing a desegregation plan but seem to have no effect on efforts in the area of human relations training. Thus, it could be that cuts in the Title IV budget have the effect of making the advisory specialist less likely to become involved in more controversial matters and more likely to become involved in the safer area of human relations training. In fact, delay or reduction in funding is negatively associated with helping a superintendent formulate or implement a desegregation plan (t_B = -.319 significant at the .05 level).

COMPARISON OF DFLEA INTERACTIONS WITH OTHER TITLE IV UNITS AND DISTRICT PERSONNEL

District Interaction Patterns

In general, advisory specialists plan their activities with administrative core personnel and target their activities to the instructional perimeter of the system; this pattern can create problems unless the advisory specialist is implementing desegregation-related activities for a committed superintendent.

Sixty-one percent of the responding Project Directors indicated that it was the superintendent who suggested the district apply for a Title IV grant. This leads us to assume that the superintendent had a purpose in mind for the Title IV funds, and we would thus expect the superintendent to take an active part in planning the dfLEA project. Actually, as Table 33 indicates, over three-quarters of the advisory specialists stated that the superintendent actively participated in the decision concerning the activities the project would undertake. The second most active groups of participants in the planning process were other district administrators. Therefore, it is primarily the administrators of the district who plan the dfLEA program.

Table 33

PLANNING OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES[a]

Planner	Percent
Superintendent	79
Other district administrators	64
School board members	49
Principals	58
Teachers	45
Parents	42
Students	32

[a]Percent of Project Directors reporting "active" or "very active" participation of various groups in the decision concerning which activities to undertake.

However, it is primarily the instructional perimeter of the district to which the dfLEA's activities are targeted. As Table 34 indicates, only 37 percent of the dfLEA Project Directors indicate frequently directing activities to the superintendent, in contrast to 74 percent who state that they frequently direct their activities to teachers.

Table 34

TARGETING OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Target	Percent
School board members	11
Superintendent	37
Other district administrators	66
Principals	67
Teachers	74
Counselors	50
Support staff	28
Students	33
Parents	36

This leads to possible ambiguity in the role of the advisory specialist, who takes directions from the superintendent but is then charged with working with school staffs. While it is possible for the advisory specialist to influence teachers and community groups who then bring pressure to bear on the superintendent and the district, it is more likely that the advisory specialist will be used to influence principals, teachers, and community groups to support the superintendent's program. This would argue that Title IV can be effective in the area of school desegregation if--and only if--the superintendent is committed to school desegregation.

Furthermore, the superintendent not only needs to be committed to desegregation for the advisory specialist to function effectively, but he also must have confidence in and be supportive of the advisory specialist. The data in Table 35 show that the advisory specialists overwhelmingly report receiving a great deal of support from their district superintendent. However, in contrast to the amount of support they perceive from the superintendent, they feel they receive much less support

Table 35

SUPPORT RECEIVED IN CARRYING OUT PROGRAM

"Great Deal" of Support Received from	Percent
Superintendent	82
Other district administrators	59
Principals	46
Teachers	33
Parents	26
Students	33

from all other levels of personnel. This reinforces our notion of the marginality of the advisory specialist and his or her dependence on the superintendent; it is not necessary to have the support of the personnel to whom the dfLEA activities are most frequently directed. If, in turn, the advisory specialist is also not vested with authority or does not have the support of the superintendent, there is little reason to expect that he will have any impact on instructional personnel in the district.

Services from Other Title IV Projects

Table 36 examines the relationship between the activities undertaken by the dfLEA and services received from other Title IV units.

Table 36

ACTIVITY TYPES BY SERVICES RECEIVED FROM OTHER TITLE IV UNITS

Services Received From	Type of Activity	
	Desegregation Planning	Human Relations Training
GAC (77%)	.110	.071
SEA (51%)	.062	.361[a]
TI (36%)	-.155	.119
Combination of above (66%)	.029	.253

[a] t_B significant at .01 level.

We notice first that over three-quarters of the responding dfLEA directors report receiving services from the nearby GAC, over one-half report receiving services from an SEA, and two-thirds report receiving services from more than one Title IV unit.

Given that 87 percent of the dfLEAs claim to be undertaking human relations training, and of these, 70 percent report that they use speakers/consultants from the GAC in this training, we would expect a large positive correlation between receiving services from the GAC and undertaking training. However, receiving services from either the GAC or the TI is not associated with the dfLEA undertaking such training. One possible explanation for why this relationship is not manifested by the data is because the dfLEAs may also be receiving supportive services from the GAC in the areas of desegregation planning as well.

Similarly, we would expect dfLEAs that are receiving services from TIs to be undertaking less human relations training rather than more, under the assumption that the TIs might be considered better equipped to undertake this training than the dfLEA. Once again, this assumption is not borne out by the data, leading us to hypothesize that the services received from the TI are supplementary to the kinds of training undertaken by the dfLEA, rather than sufficient themselves to meet the training needs of the district. We do know from our site visits of one case where the dfLEA was being served by two TIs. During the summer the dfLEA held in-service workshops with teachers on a special reading component, while one of the TIs conducted an institute that focused on counseling strategies with district counselors and some administrators. The second TI held workshops during the year to enhance the district's reading component with the participants from the dfLEA's summer workshops. The Project Directors from both TIs served on a district advisory council which met monthly throughout the year. These three Title IV projects had developed a plan and put it into operation in such a way that their services complemented each other.

Additionally, we see from Table 36 that dfLEAs being served by SEAs are involved in human relations training more frequently. Since human relations training is not normally considered to be within the SEA's area of expertise and the dfLEA Project Directors did not report

frequently using staff from the SEA to serve as speakers or consultants for their training, this statistically significant correlation could indicate that the dfLEAs are receiving funding assistance for their human relations training from SEAs. There were several instances in our field work when dfLEAs that had not received any training monies for their Title IV grant secured funds from the SEA to conduct training in their district. In one case, the SEA paid for the consultants who conducted the district's training. Therefore, while the SEA may not provide the district consultants from their staff, this correlation may reflect the fact that some SEAs underwrite the cost of the dfLEA's training.

SUMMARY

The direct grant program under Title IV usually is used to fund a single person--a desegregation specialist. This person is generally recruited from within the district from an administrative or teaching position. The activity profile of dfLEAs varies according to the stage of desegregation; Title IV funds are used for compensatory education or to augment ESAA activities once districts have completed implementation of their desegregation plan. Most advisory specialists do not feel they have a great deal of influence on district operations relating to desegregation. The position of advisory specialist seems to operate more as a staff than a line function within the school administration and hence the specialist does not necessarily have the authority to make desegregation-related decisions.

The key to advisory specialist influence appears to be superintendent and district commitment to desegregation. Our site visits indicated that the most effective advisory specialists were located where district superintendents were committed and were used to supplement the role of the superintendent in desegregation by being active in areas the superintendent does not usually get involved--building community support and working with students. In addition, given that advisory specialists plan their activities with core personnel and target their activities to the perimeter of the system, this pattern can create problems unless the advisory specialist is implementing desegregation-related activities for a committed superintendent.

VII. THE REGIONAL OFFICE

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act is administered through the regional offices of the U.S. Office of Education. Within each regional office, Title IV (along with a similarly focused program, ESAA) is handled through the Equal Educational Opportunity unit, the regional counterpart to the USOE's Equal Educational Opportunity Program. As a regionalized program, Title IV is in a pivotal position between USOE and the different project types. The responsibility for developing both the program regulations for the projects and the regional guidelines for implementing them rests with EEOP. Ten regional offices of the USOE are responsible for interpreting these guidelines and implementing them in a fashion that accommodates regional diversity without compromising the intent of the law.

The regional offices are also responsible for reviewing proposals submitted by all four project types (GAC, SEA, TI, dfLEA). Proposals are reviewed by panelists selected by regional office personnel. Panelists rate each proposal according to an established set of award criteria (for example, needs assessment, activities, objectives, and evaluation procedures), by giving scores to each proposal on the separate criteria. Points given to each award criteria are added together to provide a total score for a proposal. The total scores for a specific proposal given by all judges are summed and averaged to provide the official score. The official scores for each proposal are sent to EEOP and ranked nationally by project type. Projects are funded in rank order from the highest score until the funding allocation for a project type is exhausted (for example, 25 percent of the Title IV funds might be exhausted with the twentieth highest-ranking SEA proposal).

This section provides the major findings from a review of regional office administrative structure, field operations, and the proposal review process. The primary data source for these findings was the interviews conducted from April 1975 to August 1975 at seven of the ten regional offices and at USOE. At USOE, interviews were conducted with both administrative and operations personnel of the EEOP. At the regional

offices, interviews were obtained from respondents involved in three levels of Title IV operations. At the program implementation level, interviews were conducted with the staff members operationally responsible for implementing Title IV: the EEO Program Managers and the Program Officers. On the administrative level, interviews were obtained from the Director of School Systems, and whenever possible, from the Regional Commissioners of Education. Interviews were also obtained from a sample of panelists who participated in the proposal review process. The discussion that follows is organized by three issue areas.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS

All regional offices visited shared a common skeletal organizational structure, in which administrative responsibility for Title IV was assumed by the Regional Commissioner and the Director of School Systems. Actual operational responsibility for Title IV was vested in the EEO unit, which is a part of the Division of School Systems. Within the EEO units, the Program Manager and Program Officers were responsible for implementing both Title IV and ESAA projects. Following a presentation of some information on the demographic characteristics of the staff, this section will describe some of the administrative operations involved in implementing Title IV.

Staff characteristics. Of approximately 50 Program Officers and trainees in the seven regions, fewer than 10 percent were women. All seven Program Managers included in the sample were male. In terms of ethnicity, three of the Program Managers were black, three were white, and one was Spanish-surnamed. Of the Program Officers, approximately fifteen were black and six were Spanish-surnamed. Typically, the ethnic composition of an EEO unit reflected the ethnic composition of the regions, with the greatest concentrations of black and Spanish-surnamed EEO staff in the South and Southwest. On the other hand, there appears to be a significant underrepresentation of women--a situation which could create difficulties when sex discrimination assistance is planned.

In terms of both education and experience, the backgrounds of the Program Managers reflected a strong orientation towards school systems. The majority of Program Managers had previously served as teachers or

principals and several held M.A. degrees in educational administration. The Program Managers had typically worked in the region for several years prior to assuming their present positions, and at least one-half of them had previous experience as Program Officers in the same regions. Paradoxically, the practice of recruiting Program Managers with extensive experience among local professional educators allows for a heightened sensitivity to and understanding of local political issues yet has the risk of selecting EEO leaders who may share the antidesegregation sentiment of many of their peers.

Program Officers typically came to the EEO unit with a more diverse educational and experiential background than their managers. Program Officers were typically trained in the various liberal arts disciplines of sociology, psychology, English, education, etc. Many of them held M.A. degrees, and some held doctorates. Previous job experience for the Program Officers included positions in school systems (as teachers and principals), in the state and federal bureaucracy (as staff or Program Officers in other programs), as well as in the Peace Corps and Vista, as volunteer social activists.

Training. Both the diverse background of the staff and the lack of a "profession" geared towards effectively implementing desegregation efforts argue for the inclusion of a strong staff training program in the regional office. Such a training program would be designed to induce sensitivity to desegregation and to explore the social and political constraints involved in attempting to implement desegregation efforts. During the site visit period, no substantial training program of this type existed in any of the EEO units. Rather, new employees underwent on-the-job training through an apprentice-like arrangement with more experienced Program Officers. Though all employees had continuous training to familiarize them with changes in forms, guidelines, and procedures, there were no regularly held substantive sessions dealing with the social and political context and implications of the EEO unit's work.

Assignment of projects. While the EEO unit was responsible for implementing both ESAA and Title IV projects, the Title IV projects reportedly accounted for less than 20 percent of a Program Officer's

work. Typically, Program Officers were assigned to both types of projects within a geographic area across states or within a state. In terms of Title IV, each Program Officer was usually responsible for all activities related to implementing the project in the field. Six of the seven regions visited adhered to this pattern of project assignments. In one region, however, project responsibilities were delegated in a very haphazard fashion. Program Officers were not assigned to projects on any consistent basis, such as by state or by geographic region. Rather, the Program Officers were each assigned a few Title IV projects in each of the states in the region. At least one project in the region was never assigned to any specific Program Officer. In a further departure from procedures followed in the other six regions, the Program Officers reported that they seldom had total responsibility for any single project, but rather, that one Program Officer might be assigned to monitor a project, while the project's technical assistance needs were met by any available staff member.

Management arrangements. Based on the number of Program Officers and trainees in the unit, the EEO units were classified as either large or small. Four EEO units with two to five Program Officers and trainees were classified as small. Two EEO units with a staff of thirteen to seventeen Program Officers each were classified as large. (One EEO unit, which had a staff of seven Program Officers but operated in a fashion similar to that of the large EEO units, was classified as large.) In the small EEO units, Program Managers were actively involved in the operational aspects of the projects as well as having sole administrative authority. In the larger units, however, the Program Managers' duties were administrative; field coordination responsibilities were delegated to other staff members. In two large offices, lead Program Officers, assigned by the state, were responsible for coordinating the activities of other Program Officers within the state. In a third large unit, project coordination was delegated to two Zone Chiefs, each of whom was responsible for Project Officer operations in the states comprised by the zone.

The small EEO units tended to assign Program Officers to ESAA and Title IV projects that were in geographic proximity across states.

In summary, the management arrangements of the different regional offices varied considerably in terms of Program Manager and Program Officer responsibilities or project assignment procedures. However, this variability was apparently related to the size of the Program Officer staff involved in project implementation.

Management approach. The administrative variable that most differentiates the regional offices is the Program Manager's perception of the commitment of the Regional Commissioner. The regional offices in which the Regional Commissioner was perceived as not being committed to EEO programs but as using the office for a political springboard were characterized by low morale and little staff confidence in the effectiveness of Title IV. In these regional offices, the Program Managers reported a lack of autonomy and a lack of support from the Regional Commissioner. The lack of autonomy and lack of support were reflected in two of the regions by the Regional Commissioner's hiring of EEO staff without the consent of the Program Manager as well as by the Program Manager's reluctance to institute termination proceedings against projects for fear of adversely affecting the political ambitions of the Regional Commissioner. As the perceived commitment factor affected field operations, these regional offices reported making far fewer on-site visits (1 or 2) than did the other offices (6 to 8 site visits yearly).

Conversely, in regional offices where the Commissioner was perceived as committed to EEO goals, staff confidence in Title IV was high, staff morale was high, and the Program Managers were given the autonomy and support essential to their positions.

FIELD OPERATIONS

The Equal Educational Opportunity Program in Washington, D.C., is responsible for developing both the program regulations for the projects and the regional office guidelines for implementing the projects in the field. According to a highly placed EEOP official, the regional offices implement Title IV by providing the projects with the *procedural* and regulatory information essential to their funding and to their operational compliance with the program regulations. In essence, then,

the administrative role of the regional office is a narrowly defined one.

Even with implementation defined in narrowly procedural terms, the guidance to the regional offices for implementation tends to be diffuse and incomplete. For example, there is no formal statement to the regional office that delineates their responsibility in implementing Title IV. Rather, the charge is transmitted through meetings between the Washington EEOP staff and the Program Manager of the EEO units in the regional offices. This procedure is apparently effective in identifying the major tasks of the regional offices, since all Program Managers interviewed listed the same three tasks as the primary focus of project implementation: technical assistance, monitoring, and proposal review. The Administrative Manual, however, outlines procedures for only two tasks: monitoring and proposal review. Although technical assistance was cited as a crucial aspect of field operations by all EEO staff, there was a great deal of variation both within regional offices and between them regarding the types of activities that actually constitute technical assistance. It seems apparent that Title IV is implemented with a minimum of documented guidelines.

In sum, there is no formal charge to the regional offices by EEOP or a consistent understanding by the regional offices of what constitutes their responsibilities in implementing Title IV Regulations and Guidelines.

Technical assistance. Consistent with the procedurally oriented interpretation of implementation, the majority of the EEO staff viewed technical assistance as a process of disseminating and/or clarifying administrative and regulatory information. Specific examples of technical assistance frequently requested by the projects included assistance in budgeting, assistance in interpreting hiring/firing policies, and clarification of civil rights and program regulations. In addition to the regulatory technical assistance EEO staff also received, and whenever possible responded to, requests for program-related technical assistance. Examples of these requests included information for resolving racial tensions as well as information regarding methods for conducting human relations workshops. As much as possible, the EEO staffs attempted to refer these types of requests to the GACs and SEAs.

Consistent with EEOP's emphasis on regulatory and procedural operations, the regional office in actual practice was perceived as being more helpful in these areas than in program areas. Tables 37 and 38 report the percent of Title IV Project Directors reporting that the regional office was very helpful in providing certain types of assistance.

Table 37

ADMINISTRATIVE/REGULATORY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical Assistance Activity	% Responding "Very Helpful"
Clarifying civil rights compliance requests	57
Clarifying Title IV regulations	68
Working out contractual problems	65
Defining authorized/nonauthorized activities	60
Determining district eligibility	55

Table 38

PROGRAMMATIC TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical Assistance Activity	% Responding "Very Helpful"
Planning an evaluation	17
Distinguishing between desegregation-related and nondesegregation-related education problems	28
Determining if objectives are achievable	30
Linking needs/objectives/activities	35

Over one-half of all Project Directors found the regional office helpful in clarifying civil rights compliance requests, clarifying Title IV regulations, working out contractual problems, defining authorized activities, and determining district eligibility. Less than one-third of all Project Directors found the regional office helpful in planning an evaluation, distinguishing between desegregation-related and nondesegregation-related activities, determining if objectives were achievable, and linking needs, objectives, and activities. In other words, the regional office was seen to be less helpful in providing assistance about the content of the program and more helpful in procedural assistance. This is consistent with the procedural thrust of EEOP assistance.

Monitoring. According to the Administrative Manual, monitoring is the systematic and periodic process of reviewing, evaluating, and reporting the programmatic and fiscal operations of an approved, funded project. The purposes of monitoring are (a) to determine whether projects are being adequately implemented; (b) to determine whether projects are in continuous compliance; (c) to determine a course of action for any identified problems; and (d) to provide a resource for planning and evaluation.

Unlike the task of technical assistance, which was not addressed by the Manual, the task of monitoring is outlined in some detail. The specific responsibilities of the Program Manager, Program Officers, and grantees are presented, and specific monitoring procedures are delineated for both the grantee reports and site visits made by Program Officers.

Self-reports by the EEO staff indicated that during the site reviews, the procedural steps outlined in the Manual were, in fact, followed. However, 5 of the 7 regional offices reported the use of regionally developed monitoring forms in addition to the USOE-provided monitoring form. Thus, while formal reports were filed on the basis of the USOE document, actual evaluation of and feedback to the projects were based on locally devised instruments. The dual monitoring forms system suggests that projects are not being consistently monitored or evaluated across regions. Further, the widespread use of the alternative monitoring forms suggests that the solution to the inconsistent evaluation problem is not merely the development of a better form imposed by the regions by EEOP. Rather, an alternative approach might be to use locally developed forms, approved by EEOP, which are congruent with the overriding monitoring efforts of EEOP. Such an approach would provide the regional offices with the flexibility to target specific regional issues and problems in implementation/compliance, and would simultaneously provide evaluation consistency on a national level.

PROPOSAL REVIEW

Proposal review is one of the major tasks of the EEO unit of the regional office, and the various steps of the review involve considerable expenditure of time during any funding year. In an attempt to make

the regional review effort as consistent as possible, the Administrative Manual delineates detailed procedures for the intake and processing of applications prior to panelling, as well as for the role of Program Managers and Program Officers during panelling. In a concomitant effort, EEOP developed a comprehensive training packet, which provides instructions to panelists reviewing Title IV applications. Basically, the training packet is designed to increase the consistency of review panels across regions and to "help ensure that no application has an advantage over any other application simply because it has been submitted in one region and not in another" (Training of Panelists Memorandum by Herman Goldberg, Director of EEOP in 1973). Using these guidelines, then, it is the goal of EEOP personnel to achieve national review standards in all regional offices.

Panel selection. Panel selection procedures and criteria for selecting panelists vary greatly from region to region. Although the Administrative Manual is very explicit about *who* may serve in the review panels, there are no guidelines regarding either selection procedures or criteria for selection. The selection procedure, in most regions, was simply to generate a list of potential panelists whose names had been solicited from the various projects and from the professional education community. In at least two regions, the list was then sent to the SEA for approval, an action which potentially allows for undue political influence from the SEA. In other regions panelists were selected by Program Managers and/or Program Officers but seemingly in the absence of any concrete selection criteria. It seems reasonable, then, to expect a great deal of variation in the quality of panelists both within regions and across regions. In fact, interviews with a cross section of panelists revealed that although many panelists understood Title IV in both a conceptual and operational level, some panelists of at least two years tenure were unable to distinguish between ESAA and Title IV program operations.

Training of panelists. Specific methods of training panelists vary greatly by region. Although the general procedures for training were well defined, the specific methods of training, as well as the amount of time allocated for training, varied considerably by region.

Such variability is probably necessary to accommodate initial differences in the background and experience of panelists. However, it also seems feasible to consistently include in the panelist training a dry-run procedure, which specifies some performance criterion for panelists and measures interpanelist reliability prior to the actual proposal review.

Scheduling of panels/proposals. Regions varied considerably in the manner in which proposals were batched and sent to panels for review. In some regions, proposals were batched by project type and sent to the panel for review. In others, proposals were reviewed by state rather than project type. In others, proposals were sent to the panels in random sequence. Given the different guidelines and quality criteria for the different project types, the random ordering of proposals was counterproductive, in that it made it more difficult for panelists to differentiate the criteria for funding. A consistent procedure could be adopted with little difficulty.

Role of the Program Officer. The role of the Program Officer solely as a resource person has the obvious advantage of allowing new applicants to enter the competition on equal footing with old established projects. However, the procedure has the disadvantage of depriving the panel of a good source of information about existing projects. It seems tenable that some system be devised to allow information about an applicant's previous "track record" to be a weighted factor in the funding evaluation.

National ranking. The regional scoring/national ranking proposal award system includes an incentive for panelists to give high scores to applicants. Across regions, Program Managers felt the national ranking system was inadequate but felt that regional allocations based on statistical criteria would also be inadequate. The need for alternative ranking mechanisms is discussed in the conclusion.

SUMMARY

Regional office responsibilities in implementing Title IV are not clearly defined either procedurally or in terms of programmatic content. There is no formal charge to the regional offices by EEOP or a consistent understanding by the regional offices of their responsibilities in

implementing Title IV Regulations and Guidelines. Regional office personnel are perceived by Title IV Project Directors as providing more helpful assistance in areas of procedural rulings rather than programmatic content.

In addition, there are a number of inconsistent forms and procedures, both in monitoring and panel review of proposals, which could be standardized. These include monitoring forms, panel review selection procedures, criteria for selecting panelists, methods of training panelists, and the manner in which proposals are batched and sent to panels for review. Proposals are presently reviewed without input from the operational person with the most knowledge of ongoing projects--the Program Officer--and are ranked nationally although scored regionally, a process which inclines panelists to give higher scores than always warranted.

VIII. THE CONTEXT OF TITLE IV OPERATIONS: AN OVERVIEW

The previous sections have examined Title IV by describing various parts of the program and their interrelationships. If the larger environment of Title IV were not explored, however, we could be accused of having a myopic perspective--one that treats important policy areas in the program as if they were isolated phenomena. Therefore, in this section we examine the context in which the program as a whole operates. Further implications of earlier data analysis are explored, and additional data are presented about the local-level context of Title IV assistance. Assertions about the education profession, the role of the federal government, and the incentive structure of regionalization are offered. In sum, a multiplicity of topics are reviewed with the purpose of specifying recommendations at a more general level.

THE LOCAL-LEVEL CONTEXT OF TITLE IV ASSISTANCE

Earlier we noted that the desegregation environment at the district level was a critical variable in explaining Title IV project office impacts; for TIs and dfLEAs, an amenable desegregation environment was found to be a necessary condition for impact, whereas for GACs it was a contributing factor. Another study (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975) of direct federal grants to school districts for the purpose of introducing and incorporating innovative educational programs at the local level also found the local context to be "the major influence on its [a program's] prospects for effective implementation." If local receptiveness seems to be a necessary or contributing condition for successful implementation of federal programs, it would seem useful to measure the frequency with which the local environment for Title IV is receptive or not.

We did not ask client district personnel directly about their receptiveness of Title IV programs, but we can measure the Rand staff's judgments about district "amenability to the desegregation movement," which provides an indirect measure of the local context.* What the data

*The operationalization of this variable is reviewed in Sec. VII.

show is that most Title IV assistance was provided in somewhat unreceptive contexts. Of the 67 districts scored on this variable, 48 percent were judged to be in the least amenable categories (1-2), 37 percent were in the middle range (3-4), and only 15 percent were judged as amenable to Title IV assistance (5-6). This distribution is particularly disturbing in light of our earlier data analysis. These results imply that the principle of maximizing impact by working in receptive local contexts has been largely ignored in the granting of Title IV funds. The Rand evaluation is not the first to make this point; the earlier Commission on Civil Rights evaluation notes it as well. One can certainly argue with good reason that less receptive clients should be assisted. But it is not so certain that so many of these limited Title IV funds should be allocated to such environments, and this seems to happen unless conscious consideration is given to the local context in the funding procedure. Under present circumstances, it is difficult for the program to have a broad-based impact because the local context for assistance is generally unreceptive.

In addition, the present mix of Title IV client school districts encourages a project office to adopt a passive stance overall, thus further diminishing the possibilities of significant change even under circumstances where it could occur. Faced with a number of recalcitrant districts, a Title IV project office is less likely to develop a long-range plan to promote innovation in school districts when the cues are so clearly negative. Whatever commitment to social change exists at the Title IV project office is probably mitigated by the fear that too aggressive a posture will only create trouble and diminish the possibility of the office being called upon by the district in the future. Consequently, the mutual adaptation process, in which project offices and districts compromise on the set of goals both can pursue, can be prejudiced in the direction of obtaining less of an impact than could be achieved because a defensive posture must be adopted. In essence, change does not occur because the project office fails to adapt the program to local needs, but because the innovation is modified by the district to the point where no change can occur. In an extreme case, mutual adaptation can be distorted to become a process in which project offices

agree to provide only trivial services in exchange for entry into a school district and nothing more.

This does not have to occur. In our field work we discovered examples in which the project office showed a sensitivity to client needs but did not surrender its own goals in the process. One GAC judged highly effective used a rigorous needs assessment procedure to force less amenable districts to recognize needs that in some cases they might wish to ignore. Yet this could occur probably only because the center had established credibility in those districts through several years of nonthreatening assistance, characterized by one district superintendent as "never giving us anything we couldn't live with." Thus, the passive nature of the earlier assistance was used as a means for first establishing credibility and pursuing objectives later.

The major point is that such examples are few, and unless a Title IV project office is extremely motivated, the district environment it works in does not encourage it to pursue innovation. Such a circumstance could be changed by giving serious consideration to the district environment in the funding process, and we have suggested some means to do this.

THE PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT OF ASSISTANCE: TITLE IV AND THE POLITICS OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

Prior to examining the federal-level context, it is necessary to examine the professional recruiting stream that provides the majority of Title IV operational personnel. There are, of course, exceptions to the generalizations noted here, but the assistance delivered under Title IV occurs within a generalized network of professional relationships, which can be called a "system." By this term we mean regular ways of acting and believing by persons whose roles and tasks are aimed at achieving common goals. This familiar concept in sociology has long been applied to the educational structure since at least the founding of the journal, *Sociology of Education*. (Wirt and Kirst, 1972.)

The public education system, like many systems, has set membership criteria; members of the system are education professionals socialized through schools of education into a somewhat common frame of reference and a commitment to professionalism. Not only are classroom teachers, principals, and school superintendents required formally to hold credentials, but informal norms guarantee that the majority of the personnel in State Departments of Education and in the USOE and its regional offices are educators as well. Communication is maintained through a set of meetings and journals, which define the issues in education so that they are consistent with the profession's ideology and its system-maintenance needs.

Finally, the system is welded together by an elaborate set of exchanges. School superintendents hire graduates of education schools, but education school deans recommend superintendents for positions in larger districts; state and federal officials give funds to school districts, but local school boards provide the political support to keep state and federal legislators in office.

Thus unified by professionalism, communication, and interdependence, the system is able to perform many functions. Here we need to focus on only one, which is characteristic of all systems--system maintenance, the defense of organizational goals in which the system's resources are invested and to which its members are committed.

When we ask what the goals are in which schools have invested their resources in the past, it is clear that desegregation was *not* one of them--as countless court decisions attest. Hence it is the case that Title IV by various "seeding" policies seeks to move schools towards desegregation by redistributing their resources permanently. So we should expect to find client schools resisting such redefinition of goals and redistribution of resources on the basis of "system maintenance" alone, let alone the added controversial policy area of school desegregation.

Title IV also does not escape the problems created by system-maintenance behavior when it reaches outside the public schools and goes to universities for help. The higher education system has its own goals, and neither community service nor desegregation is usually high among

them. The academic community values scholarly research as its most important product; service plays a secondary role. The faculty is usually on a national "publish or perish" status ladder where work of a service nature is sometimes accorded little value and in many cases serves as evidence that the faculty member is not seriously committed to scholarship. Thus there is little incentive for a university faculty member to devote his or her energies to the successful operation of a Title IV project. The university also has its own system-maintenance needs. Title IV funding can be used to support graduate students, to subsidize faculty salaries, or to generally enhance the prestige of the institution.

As we shall see, the system-maintenance behavior of the education profession is rooted in the federal-level context and acts as a constraint on both the goals and activities of federal-level personnel.

TITLE IV ASSISTANCE AS VIEWED FROM THE FEDERAL LEVEL

To understand the operation of Title IV one should keep in mind the limitations which American federalism imposes upon Washington. Orfield, describing the various failures of federal agencies to successfully compel local officials to meet federal standards, states the problem succinctly:

> From the beginning, a Congress sensitive to localism has created problems characterized not by federal control, but by a bargaining situation, with the states and localities operating at a substantial advantage. The federal-state relationship has been one of diplomatic cooperation, with national officials trying to advise or persuade rather than direct local and state administrators. (Orfield, 1969, p. 7.)

As federal administrators saw that Congress would be more sympathetic to local officials than to themselves, they realized that attempts to enforce federal regulations were simply a bluff easily called. As Key wrote nearly forty years ago, federal agencies were likely to "close their eyes to frequent departures from the conditions of the federal grants." (Key, 1937, p. 167.) If this statement is generally true about the role of the federal government in influencing local activities, it

is nowhere more true than in the case of education. For historical reasons, education is the most localized of all activities of government in the United States. Orfield (1969, p. 9) writes:

> Historically the conviction that education was a central local function was so strong that decades of agitation were required even before the Office of Education could be established as a powerless office for collecting educational statistics and publishing miscellaneous reports. The survival and success of the agency has depended upon its ability to accommodate state and local school officials.

This situation manifests itself clearly in the confused role assigned to the USOE by Congress. Sometimes, legislation instructs the USOE to act as a nationalizing force in education, to prod recalcitrant school districts to conform to national standards of quality or reform. On the other hand, every member of Congress is elected from a local constituency, and even the most committed members have at least one eye focused on how well their state or district is faring in obtaining its share of the "social welfare pork barrel." (Stockman, 1975.)

In addition, local school officials who object to "federal intrusion" have a ready channel in their state political system, their congressman, and even in the Office of Education itself for combatting federal pressures--USOE regional offices. The loyalty of these regional field offices to their localities is sustained by a policy of recruitment of professional educators from the local regions. Thus, the system-maintenance behavior of the education profession is instilled at the federal level by regional decentralization, an effort probably inspired by the idea of bringing government "closer to the people," but which actually ends up to be staffed by persons with professional interests not always in concordance with federal efforts. The result is to greatly weaken USOE's ability to initiate or implement change. Simply put, the USOE is often placed in the position of attempting to implement federal

programs without consistent support from Congress, its own bureaucracy, and from its client school districts.

THE OPERATION OF TITLE IV UNDER POLITICAL CONSTRAINTS

The result of combining a difficult local context with the system-maintenance behavior of educational professionals and the absence of any clear mandate to USOE is that Title IV has been tailored to conform to the considerable constraints placed upon it. The following four circumstances represent logical extensions of this understanding of the larger context in which Title IV operates and the way in which they often manifest themselves in program operations: the tendency to replace administrative judgment by universally applied proposal criteria; the tendency to replace a concern with the substance of the program with a focus on procedures; the tendency to provide education-related rather than desegregation-related assistance; the tendency to solicit the support of local district officials rather than to promote change in school districts.

The tendency towards universalism appears in the funding process. Panelists who are not USOE employees make funding decisions based on the reading of written proposals. This procedure ensures that all submissions have an equal chance; the system cannot discriminate either in favor of or against new submissions as opposed to proposals for refunding, for example. Panel judges are not permitted to discuss the past success of the projects and projects are not visited by panelists. Recommendations for funding are made on the basis of numeric scores assigned to proposals, and the funding level is negotiated with little regard to the substance of the proposal. This system has the advantage that it places the USOE and its regional offices beyond the reach of criticism from unfunded projects. On the other hand, it enables awards to be made on the basis of minimal information, it can reward "grantsmanship" rather than competence, and it permits administrative judgments to be avoided in the name of "fairness."

The focus on procedures can be seen in Project Directors' ratings of regional office assistance. Earlier we noted that project offices rated programmatic assistance by the regional office as less helpful

than procedural assistance. This does not mean that regional offices are somehow "not doing their job." It merely means that the tendency exists for regional offices to focus on procedures. One would not want the Title IV program to be overly concerned with specifying the direction of technical assistance at the federal level, since regional diversity is sufficient to make the *application* of specific substantive direction from Washington untenable. The problem is that at present regional office monitoring and Washington Regulations and Guidelines are concerned almost exclusively with procedural details. This means of necessity that some contractors are doing the wrong thing or doing it badly with no corrective feedback mechanism in the system. It also means that some projects are floundering, unable to decide what to do or how to do it.

The tendency to provide education-related assistance is in line with professional goals. However, the situation is made even more difficult by the lack of a clear definition of desegregation-related assistance--that policy goal toward which Title IV technical assistance is ostensibly directed. Does it mean merely physically combining minority and majority students in formerly all-white or all-minority schools? Or does it go further, requiring programs of education that facilitate a state of integration in newly desegregated schools? Are programs desegregation-related when they are designed to raise the achievement levels of all students in a school? Or further, are programs desegregation-related when they are designed to raise the awareness of majority students? As long as there is no intervention by USOE in the rulings of its differently intentioned regional offices, we can expect that the present system will define practically every education-related program as also being desegregation-related.

Finally, the local context most often inclines project offices to minimize dissonance by adopting a nonaggressive posture. Hearing an uncertain trumpet from more distant Washington and a strident outcry from the nearby districts, the change agent tendencies of a Title IV project are inclined to be overwhelmed. The same process of increasing congruency in preferences between official and client has been seen for a century in the operations of federal regulatory agencies, which started

with much more coercive power than any Title IV project office has ever known. (McConnell, 1969.)

SUMMARY

This section is not intended as an indictment of Title IV. One can hardly expect a particular program to be totally change-oriented when it operates as part of a society that is change-resistant. Given the policy pressures that operate on the entire Title IV program, it would be difficult to develop a specific set of expected program outcomes. It would be even more difficult to hold individual projects accountable for those outcomes. What the program can do, however, and what we feel is crucial for its meaningful operation is that it begin to operate with a specific *mission*, or general charge which may be articulated differently for each of the various project types. The following section contains our recommendations, most of which are geared toward helping the program function within a more deliberate desegregation-related mission.

IX. PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

The preceding sections have described Title IV operations in terms of theories of intervention and variables that could affect their service delivery. This section builds from the previous analyses and includes some additional data to synthesize a set of policy recommendations. To do this, the section will be organized into major policy areas identified from earlier data analysis. Desegregation status of the client school districts is one such policy area. It will be examined primarily because the earlier material on TIs and dfLEAs indicates that the district desegregation environment is important to their operations. District interaction patterns will be reexamined because of their importance to all project types. For the same reason, a discussion of the relationship between the Title IV project office and its host institutions is justified. Finally, the area of regional office operations will be explored.

Although the regulations make some provision for differences between the four project types of Title IV, there presently is an incomplete recognition of the need to use nonspecified award criteria for them. The recommendations in this section attempt to suggest ways of maximizing the unique advantages of each project type and makes recommendations for USOE regional and Washington program offices as well.

RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON AN ANALYSIS OF THE DESEGREGATION ENVIRONMENT OF CLIENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS RECEIVING TITLE IV ASSISTANCE

Earlier analysis indicated that when the district was involved in desegregation efforts, TI assistance was more related to desegregation assistance than traditional education assistance. Also, mail questionnaire data indicated that the activity profile of the dfLEA advisory specialist varied by the desegregation status of the district. We now turn to a more specific analysis of the role and importance of desegregation status.

Unfortunately, inherent and operational difficulties did not allow us to obtain timely and accurate information about the desegregation

status of the client school districts we visited. Partly as a surrogate measure for desegregation status, the Rand site visit team was asked to rate each client school district in terms of the district environment's amenability to movement in the direction of supporting school desegregation. In other words, on the basis of information obtained in the school districts, interviewers were asked to judge the extent to which the local environment was inclined in favor of or against school desegregation. We have measured desegregation *environment* rather than desegregation *status*.

The overall interviewer rating of district amenability was based on a combination of measures including the extent to which the local school board, district voters, and district superintendents favored the legal requirement of school desegregation. This was assessed by asking specific questions in each of the three cases during interviews with multiple-level personnel when possible. (A description of the interviewer ratings appears as Appendix C.) We are aware of the difficulty of making judgments in this area after spending only a single day in a school district and talking to a limited number of people; nevertheless, the results of the data analysis to be presented lend a good deal of credibility to the ratings, since our interviewers could not have anticipated either the hypotheses or the complicated correlation patterns necessary to substantiate the recommendations that follow.

Table 39 reports the correlation between district amenability to desegregation and the impact of Title IV by type of impact and type of project (dfLEA impact measures were not scored because of extremely wide variation in activity profiles of visited districts). The major finding of this table is that a GAC or TI is judged more effective when the district environment is more favorably inclined to desegregation but that an SEA is not. State Education Agency impacts are not related to the local desegregation environment. This is consistent with our earlier finding that interviewers judged the SEA most effective when undertaking technical assistance or information dissemination activities and when the state was committed to desegregation. Neither of these conditions is dependent on district amenability.

Table 39

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN DISTRICT AMENABILITY AND TYPE OF IMPACT BY TYPE OF PROJECT

Project Type	Type of Impact[a]		
	District Policy/ Program/Personnel	Training	Institutional
GAC	.538[b] (33)	.388[b] (32)	.186 (19)
TI	.381 (8)	.187 (8)	(c)
SEA	-.081 (13)	(c)	-.175 (12)

[a]Summary Index of Impact is described in detail on p. 36.

[b]t_B significant at .01 level.

[c]This type of impact inappropriate for this project type.

A positive correlation indicates that the *necessary* conditions have been met; namely, that there is an association between a GAC and TI having an impact at the local level and a district's amenability to desegregation. But to establish the *sufficient* condition (namely, that existence of an amenable local district environment completely explains whether a GAC or TI has an impact), two more conditions have to be met:

1. The correlation between project office operations variables and the district *amenability* measured must be positive and high.
2. The correlation between project office operations variables and the district *impact* measures must be reduced to zero when a control is introduced for district amenability.

On the basis of our earlier discussions of the GAC and TI, we would expect that the first condition would hold much more for the TI than for the GAC. We noted that the GAC tended to operate as an independent organization, with an incentive structure to maintain its own organizational viability both in the environment of the university and the local school district. Also, as the omnibus organization, the GAC works both with districts at varying stages of desegregation and with multiple

levels of personnel in the same district. We suggested that the TI is a different kind of organization. The type of assistance provided by the TI was much more dependent upon the planning phase of district interaction. Though existing as an institution in theory, the relationship between the education department and institute staff, plus the TI's limited focus, both in terms of type of assistance and summer-based work, results in the TI functioning more as an entity of both the host institution and the school district. As such, we would expect a much closer connection between the district and the institute than we would between the GAC and its client districts. We would predict, therefore, that the statistical correlation between project office characteristics (e.g., planning, organization and management, and implementation) and district amenability should be higher for TIs than for GACs, since TIs do not function independently of district needs.

Table 40 shows both the predicted and the actual level of correlation between district amenability and project office characteristics for GACs and TIs. Of course, the prediction table was derived from our previous understanding of how GACs and TIs operate. The prediction is

Table 40

PREDICTED AND ACTUAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DISTRICT AMENABILITY TO DESEGREGATION MOVEMENT AND PROJECT OFFICE CHARACTERISTICS

Prediction Table	Organized Planning Function	Organization Management	Staff Capability	Project Office Operations
		Predicted Level		
GAC	+	+	+	+
TI	++	++	++	++
		Actual Level		
GAC	.311	.412[a]	.293	.221
TI	.429	.866[b]	.455	.504[c]

[a] t_B significant at .01.

[b] t_B significant at .001.

[c] t_B significant at .05.

verified. For all four project office characteristics, the level of correlation between district amenability and project office characteristics is approximately twice as high for TIs as it is for GACs. This means that TI project office operations are more often positively associated with district amenability to desegregation than are GAC project office operations. Thus, our examination of the observation that district amenability explains the local impact of TIs and GACs has confirmed earlier data analysis showing that TIs are much more dependent on the district environment for their operations than GACs. We need one step more.

As mentioned above, a correlation between project office characteristics and district-level impacts which statistically controls for district amenability will be necessary in order to explain the district impact of a given project type. In other words, if the relationship between project office characteristics and having an impact in the district is *not* reduced to zero when it is controlled by district amenability, we can say that district amenability is *not* responsible for explaining that relationship.

Our earlier discussion of GAC and TI organizational differences leads to a second prediction: District amenability is responsible for explaining whether project office characteristics have an impact at the local level for TIs but not for GACs. The predicted and actual results appear in Table 40. The prediction table indicates that introducing the control variable will not reduce the impact or organizational characteristics for GACs but it will for TIs. The data table shows that the results hold as predicted, namely, that whether a district has a favorable desegregation environment or not does *not* reduce the importance of organizational characteristics for a GAC, but whether organizational characteristics have an impact or not for TIs depends on the favorable desegregation environment of the district.

That is, when a GAC has a well-organized plan for dealing with school districts, it does not need to work only in favorable desegregation environments to have an impact. Similarly, when a GAC functions with a management plan including explicit schedules and objectives, it does not need to limit its operation to districts with favorable

desegregation environments to have an impact. These results are important because they allow us to argue that the desegregation environment of the client districts should *not* be used as funding criteria for GACs.

This does not imply that GACs can work with any district, only that desegregation status is not a sufficient criterion for selecting districts where assistance will be most effective. Our field work experience reveals that the GACs judged most effective by our interviewers have a clear concept of the assistance process and are rather selective in choosing districts where they can anticipate a favorable impact. However, the existing statistical point system for funding (which encourages GACs to seek requests for assistance from districts with large minority population) hampers this selectivity by providing them with an incentive for working with more and larger districts. Therefore, we recommend that the statistical point award criteria be discarded.

These results lead us to recommend an additional award criterion, which measures GAC organizational characteristics in the proposal review system, since organizational characteristics have an independent effect on local-level impacts regardless of the district desegregation environment. The organizational criteria could include the presence or absence of (1) a specific plan for serving all school districts in the service area; (2) a long-range plan of assistance; (3) explicit milestones for client school districts; (4) clear descriptions of staff responsibilities; and (5) prescribed feedback by staff and client LEAs. This would increase the probability that GACs should be selected and judged on the basis of their advance planning and conceptualization of the change process.

As indicated above, our data analysis turned out quite differently for TIs. It indicates that the impact of the TI is more dependent upon the environment of the client school district than are other project types. As a result, if a TI develops explicit schedules or milestones, it may not be due to organizational capabilities but because the districts it works with are amenable to desegregation. This implies that when a district is not planning to desegregate, the TI probably undertakes more traditional in-service training, whereas when the district is planning to desegregate, it is likely to get assistance on specific

desegregation-related problems in the classroom. Since many other programs are available for training professional educators, it is reasonable to suggest that TI funding be tied to clients with favorable desegregation environments.

Unfortunately, the wide variation in activity profiles and the small number of dfLEA districts we visited did not allow us to score any impact measures for them. However, earlier we noted several reasons why the advisory specialist's role was dependent upon the district commitments to desegregation. Also, our data analysis indicated that after implementation of a desegregation plan the dfLEA began to augment ESAA assistance and compensatory education. Thus, as in the institute situation, the district environment is a critical variable.

A favorable district desegregation environment can be operationally defined as one in which the district either is voluntarily desegregating or is responding to a court order. Thus, we suggest that dfLEA and TI grants be limited to districts under any of these conditions:

- Under federal (including Office of Civil Rights), state, or local court order for new desegregation.
- Under suit by an individual, or a local or national pressure group, to prohibit resegregation.
- Implementing or in the last year prior to implementing a voluntary desegregation plan.

Regarding the SEA, our data analysis found that in general the SEA's impact is unrelated to the *district* desegregation environment. On the other hand, those SEAs judged effective by our interviewers were in states that showed a high commitment by the *state department* to desegregation. We recommend that in all cases except those in which the level of state commitment is high, the average SEA grant be reduced to a level consonant with those activities judged effective. Our interviewers were most impressed with SEA efforts in the areas of information dissemination (including sources for minority recruitment). This does not, of course, exhaust all possible areas of technical assistance in which SEAs might be effective. Nevertheless, it indicates that the

technical assistance role for an SEA may be handled at a lower average funding level. In many cases a single staff person and a secretary would be sufficient to accomplish those previously described tasks. This is not to indicate that all funded SEAs should necessarily consist of such a limited staff. Where the state commitment to desegregation is high, however, it would be useful and helpful to continue to fund a large Title IV unit. But where the state commitment is lacking or there is no clear state policy with procedures for its *enforcement* (as presently seemed to be the case in the overwhelming majority of states we visited), both the activity profile and SEA district interaction pattern indicate that a smaller scale of activities would allow the SEA to operate more effectively in areas in which it is stronger.

Information dissemination by SEAs could perform a useful function for the Title IV program. We suggested that dfLEA and TI grants be tied to district desegregation status. The SEAs could be used to gather information, such as which LEAs in its jurisdiction are under various types of court rulings or have implemented voluntary desegregation plans. An annual summary of the desegregation status of districts compiled from SEA reports could be provided to the regional office before each funding cycle. These reports could be valuable information for other regional office programs as well.

In addition, since client LEA amenability is not related to project office impacts for SEAs, we believe that the requirement that SEAs solicit requests for assistance from local districts to work with them is an unnecessary constraint (two SEA Project Directors made this request). Such a requirement is sensible for TIs and GACs, since they cannot work effectively without district cooperation. The only advantage to the present system for SEAs is that district superintendents are informed about the availability of Title IV services. There are better procedures to accomplish this than the present system, however.

An alternative procedure would be for the SEA to send out a newsletter informing *all* districts about their available services, emphasizing that the SEA can also provide information about services available from other Title IV agencies, such as the district's nearest GAC or TI. Also, this SEA newsletter could be used as a means to inform districts

about the availability of direct grants to school districts and the conditions for those grants.

In sum, our data analysis and field work examining the role of the desegregation commitment in Title IV lead us to recommend:

- Only districts with favorable desegregation environments should be awarded dfLEA grants.
- Training Institute client districts should be limited to those with favorable desegregation environments.
- General Assistance Centers should be given flexibility in selecting client school districts with any desegregation status and not be required to work with all districts requesting assistance.
- An additional point award criterion for GACs should be added measuring effective organizational characteristics.
- Except when state commitment to desegregation is high (clear state policies exist with procedures for enforcement), SEAs should be funded primarily for information dissemination activities, and SEAs should then undertake some massive information dissemination (e.g., a newsletter), which informs districts of their services.

RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON AN ANALYSIS OF DISTRICT INTERACTION PATTERNS

To review interactions with district personnel briefly, the GACs (the omnibus organization) both plan and target their technical assistance and training to the administrative core and instructional personnel. The SEA (quick response mode) is characterized more often by planning and targeting to the highest administrative levels. Finally, the TI is characterized by planning at the administrative core level and planning and targeting to the instructional perimeter.

The GAC needs time to develop credibility with multiple levels of district personnel as well as to develop its own viability as an independent organization in the university setting, Other data analysis shows that the longer a GAC has been funded the more likely it is to engage in multiple activities. In addition, we encountered many

circumstances during our field work in which district-level personnel pointed out that past contacts provided the basis for present assistance. The current tendency for GACs to narrow their focus of activity because of a time constraint caused by lack of multiyear funding could ultimately result in the Title IV program losing the two primary advantages of GAC services to local school districts--breadth and depth of service delivery.

Data were presented that did not substantiate the requirement of multiyear funding for TIs; the longer a TI is funded the greater its tendency to engage in more technical assistance related activities. This is in line with the finding that over time TIs are more closely tied to district objectives in the sense that they become more involved in immediate problem-solving activities and less involved in training. However, this situation might be quite different if TI funding were targeted to districts with amenable desegregation environments, and multiyear funding could be quite useful.

Follow-up procedures by TIs could not only help alleviate the problem of providing support for trainers when they return to their districts but could also interface appropriately with the TI district interaction patterns. Follow-up could help assure that TI services were adequately targeted and, since these procedures would probably require the consent of the superintendent, would involve core personnel on an as-needed basis.

State Education Agencies tend to target their activities to administrative core personnel. Other data indicate that when SEAs target their activities to perimeter personnel, they do relatively little planning with them. This implies that teacher training, for example, could be undertaken with one set of objectives by the program participants and another by the superintendent, and that the Title IV person would more often be aware of only the superintendent's perspective. The result could be troublesome for such SEA assistance and would reinforce the tendency for the SEA to operate in a quick response mode with higher administrative personnel only. Therefore, narrowing the scope of SEA activities to core personnel would probably result in more efficient operations.

Since interrelationships with district personnel play a critical role in the program and expertise in effective service delivery of technical assistance is not widespread, we suggest a program of staff in-service training-based workshops held regionally. These workshops would also provide opportunities for Title IV projects to exchange ideas about techniques of assistance. (This recommendation was proposed by a number of GAC staff members.) Our recommendations follow:

- Permit multiple-year funding for GACs because it would permit them to maximize both their institutional requirements and method of operating in school districts.
- Add an additional point award criterion for TIs assessing follow-up procedures.
- In cases in which there are low levels of state commitment, SEAs should target their activities to administrative personnel.
- Establish a regionally based in-service training program for Title IV project staff to develop the necessary skills for effective relationships with school district personnel.

RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A TITLE IV PROJECT AND ITS HOST INSTITUTION

The data analysis mentioned earlier in the report indicates that the relationship between the host institution and the Title IV project office is important for all project types. For example, it was indicated that a primary constraint on desegregation-related activities for GACs is likely to be its own host university. State Education Agencies need a high level of state commitment to be judged effective, and TIs need to do training in districts with amenable desegregation environments or else they tend to undertake activities reinforced by their professional education network. Finally, we indicated that the range and type of duties for the advisory specialist were related to the superintendent's commitment to desegregation and the specialist's position in the district.

Present Title IV program regulations *presume* that any of the four Title IV project types are capable of acting effectively independent of their institutional setting. We have seen that this is not the case.

Presently there is no provision in the award criterion for institutional setting. The result is that a specific project that is judged effective on other criteria might not be able to operate effectively because it is hamstrung by its own host institution. Therefore, we feel it is necessary to devise a measure of administrative independence from the host institution in which each Title IV agency is housed.

We began with the notion that the public/private distinction in university settings would be an important one for GACs. Our field work did not bear this out. Title IV agencies exhibited varying degrees of isolation from alumni pressure regardless of whether that institution was public or private, and this isolation seemed to be the primary distinction. At the same time, we observed that in some cases GACs with too direct a connection to their education departments tended to be more conservative. Hence, the idea that autonomy or independence of the Title IV agency was an important variable emerged when we visited GACs.

On the other hand, our dfLEA and SEA site visits raised the possibility that *dependence* was an important criterion of effectiveness. Many SEA and dfLEA projects were judged as more effective by our interviewers because the state or district showed evidence of a desegregation commitment, and the Title IV person was *administratively tied into the state or district administrative structure.* In these cases, independence from the major administrative unit was not perceived to be advantageous.

The important link in all cases is the amenability of the host institution to desegregation-related assistance. When the host institution is perceived as less amenable, the appropriate relationship for a Title IV unit is *independence.* When large SEA grants are awarded because a state shows commitment to desegregation, the Title IV Project Director should be administratively tied into the state structure, preferably by placement at a high administrative level, but minimally, the requirement for formal reports to the chief state school officer would provide the incentive for a close connection. The organization chart included in the project proposal should be inspected by panel judges for evidence of important administrative standing by the Title IV Project Director. The same situation is appropriate for the dfLEA

advisory specialist. If grants are awarded on the basis of the district desegregation environment, measures should be devised to ascertain the administrative connection to the superintendent. Of course, such formal measures can be evaded in operation, and Title IV program personnel could probably conceive of stronger measures.

In sum, we suggest that the proposal review process devote considerable attention to the proposed project's relationship with its host institution. In the case of university or college based projects, considerations of the location of the project within the administrative hierarchy and the autonomy of the project are both important considerations. At a general level, when the host institution is likely to be less amenable to desegregation assistance by the Title IV unit, try to ascertain that the unit is *independent* of the host institution structure. When the host institution is likely to be more amenable to desegregation assistance by the Title IV unit, attempt to tie the Title IV unit as closely as possible to the administrative structure of the host institution. Our specific recommendations are:

- The possibility of adding a point award criterion for GAC autonomy from the host institution should be examined. There are measurement problems inherent in such a criterion, but if they can be surmounted, this could be an important indicator of project success.
- Advisory specialists of dfLEAs should also be directly organizationally linked to the district superintendent as a condition of the grant award (in addition to the desegregation environment of the district).

THE REGIONAL OFFICE

Before proceeding to specific recommendations, it is important to make a major point. The intent of "regionalization" of a federal program is to allow variations of the particular regional setting to influence policy implementation. This implies that various substantive criteria could be interpreted differently by regional offices depending upon the context of the technical assistance rendered by a Title IV

project. The earlier section concerning regional office operations describes the major role of a regional office as primarily procedural. The foci of the recommendations that follow are also procedural. In this matter, we allow for various substantive interpretation of criteria to exist within a regional program but suggest that the procedural mechanisms for implementing variation in the programs be made more consistent. The distinction between "inconsistent" versus "regional" interpretation is that in the latter case there exists a series of policy rulings which is referred to as the basis for the underlying decision. Although the decision may vary from region to region, the important point is that criteria exist by which the decision is made. Inconsistency, on the other hand, refers to variation in regional office rulings which is due to the fact that *no* criteria exist to which regional offices can refer and hence there exists a wide variation from region to region for both the mechanisms and justifications for specific rulings. Examples of this include variation in monitoring forms, methods of panel judges selection, and training of panel judges. The overall thrust, then, of the following recommendations is to eliminate what we understand as "inconsistency" by standardizing procedures across regions, while permitting regional variation to exist within the program.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

At present, the administrative structure at the district contact levels, namely, Program Managers and Project Officers, did not strike us as being properly constituted for sex discrimination assistance. We suggest a better balance in terms of sex for both Program Managers and Project Officers, particularly since they are the operational personnel that school districts are most likely to encounter.

In terms of staffing, the commitment of the Regional Commissioner to school desegregation was found to be an important factor in the structure of the office and the effectiveness of program operations in the sense of their having direction and design. The Regional Commissioner's commitment to desegregation can be determined at the appointment stage. We do not think that there are any objective background criteria that will identify an effective Title IV Program Officer, just

as there are no such criteria for identifying effective GAC staff. However, we are aware that Title IV project monitoring requires somewhat different skills and experience than other federal programs require; hence, we recommend that Program Officers be provided opportunities for in-service education at meetings held in more than one region. Our recommendations are:

- More women Program Managers and Program Officers should be appointed.
- Interregional in-service education programs for Program Officers should be developed.

Field Operations

We suggest a conference between Washington-based and regional EEOP officials to decide upon consistent administrative criteria to be used as the basis for program operations. It is important, at this point, to remind the reader of an earlier distinction. There is a difference between establishing consistent criteria and interpreting those criteria consistently. For example, it seems reasonable that regional office personnel could establish that follow-up procedures used by TIs should be a focus of investigation for a Program Officer when he or she monitors a TI. That does not mean that follow-up procedures have to be interpreted the same way from region to region given the specific circumstances of the region's Title IV projects. What we aim for is that the same criteria be used to administer or monitor projects across regions with "regional variation" being understood as different interpretations of the *same* criteria. The purpose of the suggested meeting would be to establish the same criteria, not to ensure that those criteria be interpreted the same from region to region. We feel that this will develop a national thrust for the program and at the same time permit regionalization to operate.

The actual monitoring forms vary from region to region although there is a standardized federal form. We suggest a national meeting to revise the federal form to make it more in line with those actually

used by the regional offices. This leads us to the following recommendation:

- National agreement should be obtained on a common set of monitoring forms and administrative procedures.

PROPOSAL REVIEW

We suggest that the same criteria for selecting panel judges be used across all regions to specify who should serve on the review panel in terms of occupation and tenure. Also, so that persons who are panel judges for the first time can learn the system, some specified proportion of the previous year's review judges should be on each panel. This system should be standardized for all regions (for example, 25 percent of this year's reviewers should be last year's reviewers).

The present training procedures do not seem sufficiently tight in the sense of assuring that panel judges completely understand how to review proposals. Therefore, we suggest that some method of testing be devised at the end of the training session to find out how well judges understand the instructions. One possibility is to review one or two past years' proposals for each project type and to have each panel judge score them and discuss discrepancies.

Proposals are presently presented to panel reviewers in a number of different ways. We suggest that this procedure be eliminated in favor of one of two methods currently in use at some regional offices: Either all proposals for the same project type should be reviewed simultaneously (for example, all GACs) or all proposals for various project types within the same state should be reviewed simultaneously (all GAC, SEA, TI, and dfLEA applicants from one state). A standard procedure for all regions utilizing either of these two methods can be adopted with little difficulty. Certainly, such a procedure would help judges understand their tasks better and could help the program specify interpretation of broad guidelines.

We are aware that there has been a continuing dialogue about the issue of involving Program Officers' evaluations of present projects in the review phase. Arguments against such evaluations usually revolve

around the notion of favoritism. Arguments in favor stress the Program Officer's in-depth knowledge of specific projects. The latter arguments seem more compelling to us. In addition to the present Program Officers, we suggest that other Program Officers who have had any connection with the project in past years should fill out an evaluation form as well. Finally, the form should be the same for all regions. Once again, this does not mean that regions must interpret the same criteria in the same way but that the same criteria be used for all regions. In the proposal review stage, Program Officers should be available to answer questions by the panel, so that they can better understand the reasons for specific judgments. This procedure will further increase program awareness among panel judges.

The present awards system, in which each regional office panel awards a summary quality point rating to each project, and then funding is decided by placing all projects in a single national ranking, has two disadvantages. First, it permits a regional distribution of Title IV grants that can vary dramatically from one year to the next just by chance. Second, it provides incentives for each region to bid against others. This has led to an inflation of points awarded to projects, which will probably continue and soon lead to a breakdown in the present system.

Recommendations for Improvement of Title IV at the Regional Office Level

During our interviews at the regional office, we were struck with the problematic role of the Program Officer. Sometimes, he serves as a bargaining agent for the Title IV project in its own school district, arbitrating disputes and even acting as an advocate with important personnel within the district that the Title IV person is unable to contact. At other times, his role is that of a negotiator between the district and the regional office when an administrative ruling is sought by local officials. The brokerage position can put the Program Officer in a double bind; he must be sufficiently responsive to district personnel to act on their behalf and yet distant enough from them to monitor their operation. The result seems to be that project monitoring is not understood as project *evaluation*, and there is little incentive for a Program Officer to develop an oversight function. The major point is that there does not seem to be an incentive structure for seriously

critical evaluations of ongoing projects. The opportunity for the Program Officer to report to some outside agency like a federal review panel would give him an independent base of power, which he could then use to justify critical evaluations. We are aware that such a procedure could create more friction within the regional office organization, but such friction is not of itself detrimental to the program and a good many more effective evaluations could result.

We offer these federal review strategies as food for thought rather than recommendations, since we have raised only a few of a number of political implications of such a restructuring of the proposal review process. Our specific recommendations are:

- Panel selection methods and training procedures should be changed. At a minimum, selection criteria should be standardized, a minimum percentage of panelists from previous years should be used, and they should be tested on their understanding of program operations.
- A consistent method of presenting project proposals to panel judges should be adopted. Either all proposals of the same project type should be reviewed at one time, or all projects in the same state should be reviewed at one time.
- Award decisions should include knowledge of the project's track record by means of Program Officer evaluation forms.
- Some modification of the regional ranking system should be made to ameliorate the effects of artificially high proposal ratings from some regions.

Recommendations for Improvement of Title IV at the EEOP Level

We have reviewed a number of constraints on Title IV operations: the problematic local-level context; the system maintenance behavior of the education profession; the constraints imposed by federalism; and the lack of federal support for a national program. These prompt us to make three general recommendations:

- USOE should attempt to target Title IV assistance to dfLEA and TI client districts with the greatest potential for change.

Our data show that in FY75 most Title IV assistance was provided in districts judged to be less receptive to desegregation. Of the 67 districts scored on this variable, 48 percent were judged to be in the least amenable categories, 37 percent were in the middle, and only 15 percent were judged amenable. These results imply that the principle of minimizing impact by working in receptive local contexts has been largely ignored in the granting of Title IV funds.

- USOE should provide a more explicit view of the federal mission of the program.

The one problem with the mission of Title IV is that it is unclear. Different project people see the goals of the program differently; this makes for some confusion about *what* Title IV can and cannot do. That does not mean that the thrust must be limited to assisting districts in a specific desegregation situation; we have discussed several theoretical and operational arguments for maintaining the present setup, which permits Title IV the maximum opportunity for desegregation-related assistance. However, the program should have a set of explicit goals. It is too small a program to tolerate the burden of a virtually unrestricted mandate to serve the largest number of school districts in the largest variety of ways. The lack of boundaries on the goals of Title IV agencies has cost the program much of its identity and made it extremely difficult for regional offices to give it a coherent direction. The flexibility provided by regionalization is important and should be maintained, but it should be limited to the interpretation of explicit and consistent national criteria in the light of local conditions.

- A much closer link between the regional offices and EEOP should be established.

Regional office accountability cannot be maintained with the mechanical use of routinized forms. The USOE has tended to allow Title IV to run itself. This "low profile" strategy has resulted in the diffusion of Title IV by an educational system with its own priorities. Reform

must come from EEOP because, as we have indicated, there are few other sources for change in Title IV. The danger inherent in maintaining the program with loose connections between the regional offices and EEOP is that regional educational priorities may eventually supersede national desegregation policy, turning Title IV into a program that functions purely as an adjunct to ongoing district programs.

It seems to us that the major strength of the present Title IV program is that it permits assistance to school districts in varying stages of desegregation. The major weakness is that the program's lack of specificity dilutes the benefits of such assistance most of the time, both for the districts receiving services and for the service agencies delivering them. Defining the mission, targeting assistance, and specifying agency responsibilities could help bring the program closer to its potential.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In concluding this section on policy recommendations, we state our own limitations. We do not feel that our knowledge of the program is inclusive enough to recommend specific operational procedures with the assurance that these are the best or only alternatives. Operations personnel are far more qualified to do this. Our specific suggestions are intended to be instructive rather than definitive; we hope they will be of assistance to program personnel.

Appendix A

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENTS

The actual questionnaires are included in another work (see Introduction); their addition to this report would have added approximately 180 pages. This appendix presents a synopsis of items included in the questionnaires mailed to Title IV project offices. Questionnaires were sent to Project Directors and to as many as three staff members for all FY75-funded Title IV projects. Staff members were selected by the Project Director's use of a random selection procedure included in his or her questionnaire. Project Directors listed staff alphabetically and used computer-generated random numbers to specify the staff members receiving the questionnaires.

PROJECT DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Staff characteristics--percentage breakdown of entire staff by

- Demographic categories: age, educational level, race, sex, and number of years on Title IV project.
- Types of experience: human relations, school system, teaching, and experience in desegregated working environments.

Director characteristics

- Demographic categories: age, educational level, race, sex, and number of years on Title IV project.
- Background: most recent job before becoming director, school system experience, and desegregation status of school or district when position was held.
- Present job situation: percent of time spent on Title IV and other professional duties.

Project office characteristics

- Planning: how is it determined which activities to undertake, who participates in decisions about which activities to undertake, needs assessment procedures, how are districts notified about available services.
- Implementation: frequency of specific activities, target groups for activities, evaluation procedures and changes that resulted from evaluation, implementation problems, how budget cuts are handled, extent of support by various personnel for implemented activities, and extent of interaction with other Title IV projects and federal-level personnel (regional office and USOE).

The TI and dfLEA roles in Title IV and list of authorized activities were sufficiently distinct to permit constructing a series of unique questionnaire items in each director questionnaire.

- Unique items in the TI Project Director's questionnaire included questions about strategies and methods used in training sessions, the timing and duration of sessions, participant selection procedures, and the relationship with its host institution. (This last series is also included in the GAC director's questionnaire.)
- The dfLEA Project Director is the most unique of the four because of an extremely wide variation in LEA activities and the desegregation specialist's role. Specific issue areas include questions about the stage of the district's desegregation plan, extent of specialist's influence in specific district policy areas, working relationship with the superintendent, level of desegregation activity by superintendents, impetus for funds' application, and other sources of district desegregation funds.

PROJECT STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Personnel characteristics

- Demographic characteristics: age, educational level, race, sex, and number of years on Title IV project.
- Background: most recent job before becoming staff member, school system experience, and desegregation status of school or district when position was held.
- Present job situation: percent of time spent on Title IV, other professional duties, and area of substantive expertise.

Project office characteristics

- Management: how are staff responsibilities divided, percent of time spent in districts, and personal involvement in workshops or conferences.
- Implementation: same series of questions as on Project Director's questionnaire.

Appendix B

SAMPLING PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING TITLE IV PROJECTS AND CLIENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The work statement specified that site visits be made to a specific number of Title IV projects and school districts receiving Title IV services. Table 41 shows the design principles for site visits to 40 staff projects and 74 client school districts. Hence, the units for in-depth field observation are selected from two levels:

- Project offices delivering Title IV services (GAC, SEA, TI, dfLEA).
- School districts receiving services from Title IV agencies (called "client LEAs"). Of course, given that specific project offices have been selected, the sample frame of client LEAs becomes limited to those school districts receiving services from specific project offices.

Table 41

NUMBER OF PROJECT OFFICES AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS SELECTED FOR IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Item	Project Type				
	GAC	SEA	TI	dfLEA	Total
Number of client school districts to be visited for each Title IV project type (specified by the work statement)	3	2	2	1	
Number of Title IV projects selected from each type	12	13	6	9	40
Number of client school districts matched	36	26	12		74

SAMPLE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR PROJECT OFFICES

The variables used as stratification criteria can be summarized as follows:

- Adequate representation of all project office types (GAC, SEA, TI, LEA).
- Adequate representation of regions of the country, defined with a sensitivity to desegregation problems.
- Disproportionate numbers of project offices that are not newly funded.

Cost considerations required selecting project offices that were close enough to one another to minimize extensive air travel. Obviously, when the selection of a specific project office is dependent on its proximity to another, not all project types have a known probability of selection.

The inability to obtain a probability sample of project offices means that we cannot statistically describe the relationship between this sample and the population from which it is drawn. Generalizations about the population of Title IV GACs, SEAs, TIs, or LEAs based on data gathered from these sites are not possible and should be limited specifically to this sample.

Exclusive of cost considerations, there are reasons why either a simple or disproportionate stratified random sample would not be as useful in this case as in other designs, since so few cases are involved. A simple random sample (SRS) would not produce enough information about most important sampling variables because a random draw would produce too few cases for analysis. For example, interaction between GACs and SEAs was mentioned in the work statement as a topic of paramount importance. An SRS would provide too few cases from which to generalize about GAC/SEA interaction, since in all likelihood not all SEAs would be selected in which there is also a GAC in the same state. A disproportionately stratified random sample, on the other hand, would not provide enough cases for analysis of *all* important sampling stratification variables, since specifying a probability function that favors one

variable in the design leads to providing too few cases for analysis of another. Unfortunately, then, specifying a metric to guide sample selection was less possible in our case. Our most important criterion for appropriateness of sample design shifts to adequate coverage of important sampling stratification variables.

Project Office Types

Project types should be appropriately represented in terms of their impact in the program. If the sample of project offices was selected on the basis of the funds allocation formula, 50 percent of the projects selected would be GACs, 25 percent would be SEAs, 15 percent TIs, and 10 percent dfLEAs. This allocation would result in too many resources being devoted to the analysis of GACs and too few to the dfLEAs, the latter representing the direct assistance component of the program, which itself is a focus for analysis to be compared to the indirect service agencies. To compensate for these elements, the sample of project offices is distributed as follows: approximately 30 percent GACs, 30 percent SEAs, 15 percent TIs, and 25 percent LEAs.

Regions of the Country

Since the Southwest is the primary location of project offices with bilingual programs and districts experiencing multiethnic desegregation, we decided to establish the category as a separate component of the stratification variable. The regional distribution of the project office sample is:

- 14 project offices in southern states (Alabama, Louisiana, North Carolina, Virginia).
- 14 project offices in southwestern and border states (Colorado, Missouri, New Mexico, Ohio, Texas).
- 12 project offices in northern states (Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Wisconsin).

Projects With Continued Funding

In the case of GACs and SEAs, it would be difficult to judge the effectiveness of relationships between client LEAs and those same agencies

when communications between them are in the formative stage. Hence, the GAC and SEA samples include primarily projects which are not in the first year funding stage.

SAMPLE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR CLIENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The procedure for obtaining data on the variables described below was to send requests to project offices selected for site visits for information on these variables for all of their client school districts. The specific districts were selected as follows: After narrowing this list to districts that were within 100 miles of the project office, the remaining districts were allocated to sampling strata and then specific districts randomly selected within strata. Of course, in several cases there was no variation in one or more stratification variables (for example, all client districts within a 100 mile radius of the project office might be urban). In that case, when variation was present for other client school districts, they were oversampled when they exhibited those characteristics that were not present in another case.

Urban/Rural

Because the concept or the types of activities offered by Title IV projects might vary in urban as opposed to rural districts, one would need an adequate sample of each. The small number of districts involved meant that the proportion of each type should be as close to 50 percent as possible. One uses the term "as possible," since not all project types served both urban and rural districts. If one adopted an a priori level of population as "urban," the sample of rural districts would come almost exclusively from the South. Therefore, to be responsive to local variation, we relied on the project office report of urbanization. In general, when three client LEAs were selected for a GAC, two urban LEAs and one rural LEA were selected in one-half of the cases (6), and two rural and one urban were selected for the other six. The two client LEAs selected for SEAs and TIs were divided as one urban, one rural. The urban/rural criterion was also used to select dfLEAs.

Size

Size of district is positively related to the level of urbanization, but this was not always the case. Of course, any specific number selected would not be in response to local variation, but we used a crude dividing line nevertheless; school districts with fewer than 15,000 students were considered small. We oversampled small districts in the sense that a simple random sample would have produced fewer. The reason for this was that the resource of Title IV technical assistance might be more in need in a smaller district where staff might not be as specialized and where supplementary resources might not be as available in a larger district. In those cases the impact of the Title IV might be greater in smaller school districts.

Accessibility

Project time and budget constraints determined that the only way to carry out the field work on schedule was to select client school districts within a 100 mile radius of the project offices; it was the maximum distance feasible for traveling between districts and project offices where interviewing had to be done the next day. Furthermore, we did not want to compound the uncertainties involved in traveling in unfamiliar areas with the difficulties of traveling on unmarked roads and isolated areas. Hence, we tried to limit our selection of rural client school districts to those easily accessible to major roadways (e.g., within 20 miles of a state highway). This constraint created certain problems, particularly in sparsely populated states such as Colorado, but there appears to be no propinquity bias. That is, an examination of the relationship between distance from the project office and resources expended for districts that fall into our sample showed that project offices did not appear to be focusing their resources into those districts that were closer to them.

Duration of Services

This criterion was considered important because we wanted to make sure that most districts we visited were not receiving Title IV services for the first time. We oversampled districts (in the sense that a simple

random sample would have produced fewer) where the project office was delivering services for a second year or longer because communications returns would not be fully developed in the first year, nor would a district have a sufficient understanding of the scope or availability of Title IV services to answer several important questions about project office characteristics.

Degree of Overlap With Other Title IV Project Offices

One of the work statement objectives included examination of possible duplication of services when an LEA was being served by more than one Title IV project office (for example, both a GAC and an SEA). Hence, because of our small sample size we wanted to oversample client school districts that received services from more than one Title IV project office. We expected some degree of error in our sampling procedure here because we were asking project offices to supply information about districts rather than asking the districts themselves. The predicted direction was underreporting; we expected project offices to report less overlap than actually existed, since they might not be aware of other contacts made by other Title IV agencies in the school district. Therefore, we adopted a deliberate field work strategy to discover as much overlap as possible. The interviewers were instructed to ask either the assistant superintendent or the superintendent in *all* client school districts visited about any services received by another Title IV agency. Of course, such a strategy uncovers only the district perspective of these services and as a result would not be the best strategy to evaluate the impact of overlap, since the Title IV project office also has a perspective on those same services.

In addition, approximately 10 percent of all client school districts were selected because the districts were reported to be clients of more than one Title IV project office. In those districts, two interviewers were sent in when different project participants were to be interviewed and the scope of work was more than one interviewer could handle in a single day. No more than one person interviewed either the district superintendent or assistant superintendent involved with Title IV services.

Table 42 displays the client LEA's sampling data provided by the Title IV project offices. In some cases, project offices did not supply complete information and we were forced to classify clients on the basis of information in the proposals for funding. This preliminary information often resulted in inappropriate selections, a circumstance we only encountered in the course of the field work.

Table 42

CLIENT LEA SAMPLING CRITERIA BY PROJECT TYPE AND REGION

Region	Project Type			Total
	GAC	SEA	TI	
Urban[a]	15 (48%)	13 (54%)	5 (55%)	33 (51%)
Rural[a]	17	11	4	32
NA	4	2	0	6
First funding	7	3	5	15
Longer	24 (77%)	21 (92%)	2 (29%)	47 (76%)
NA	5	2	2	9
Small size[b]	25 (73%)	17 (68%)	6 (67%)	48 (71%)
Large size	9	8	3	20
NA	2	1	0	3

Region	Region of the Country			Total
	South	Border, Southwest	North	
Urban[a]	7 (37%)	14 (52%)	12 (63%)	33 (51%)
Rural[a]	12	13	7	32
NA	4	1	1	6
First funding	4	7	4	15
Longer	15 (75%)	18 (72%)	14 (78%)	47 (76%)
NA	4	3	2	9
Small size[b]	12 (60%)	21 (75%)	15 (75%)	48 (71%)
Large size	8	7	5	20
NA	3	0	0	4

[a]As defined by the project office; obviously, the understanding of this distinction can vary from project office to project office.

[b]Less than 15,000 students in the district.

The data, by project type, show only one major difference: First-year funded districts were more often selected for TIs than for GACs and SEAs. This is not unexpected, since TIs are often not funded for more than one year, and generally they serve a relatively small number of districts.

The sampling criteria displayed by the region of the country show that we were unable to avoid the association between urban/rural and region; rural districts were more often selected in the South and urban in the North. Nonetheless, had we not used the project office ratings but an arbitrary number, the results would have been much worse. The attempt to oversample southern urban districts is apparent in the results for district size; we selected a disproportionately larger number of large school districts in the South.

Appendix C

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEWER RATING SHEETS

The final interviewer rating sheets were devised upon completion of the field work. These sheets consisted of rating dimensions followed by a series of response categories, which were used to derive a specific rating for each dimension. A theoretical term was used to describe the actual rating dimensions (such as "Organized Planning Function"). Interviewer reports were used to select the specific response categories on each dimension, such as "Formal Written Plan." The final version of the rating forms was reviewed in a one-day session during the last debriefing by all interviewers on the project.

To fill out the forms, interviewers reviewed their questionnaires and tapes to fill in specifics when an interviewer rating dimension was relevant to a specific site visit. For example, if they obtained any information at the project office about a formal written plan for activities, they included the specific details opposite the response category "Formal Written Plan" on the sheet entitled "Organized Planning Function." Interviewers used whatever specifics were listed in any response category as the basis for their ratings. Obviously, since not all interviewers were able to obtain information for all response categories, the judgments about dimensions were not always made on the basis of the same categories. Nevertheless, interviewer rating sheets provided a useful method of organizing specific details into conceptual dimensions, which in turn could be analyzed statistically.

The rating forms consisted of Guttman-type scales on a series of dimensions. Our interviewers were to select the degree to which a given project was perceived to have a certain quality, on a scale from 1 to 6.

The cover of the interview rating package included a brief description of how the package was to be used (e.g., an overall rating for each project type and one for each site-visited client LEA, when possible). This acted as a prod to the interviewers' memories and assured more consistent completion of the forms. The package itself consisted of ratings on three basic categories: Project Office Criteria Necessary for

Effective Service Delivery; Project Office Interaction with LEAs; and Miscellaneous Ratings. The remainder of this appendix will be devoted to a description of the contents of these three categories.

PROJECT OFFICE CRITERIA NECESSARY FOR EFFECTIVE SERVICE DELIVERY

On the basis of our debriefings, the interviewers' consensus was that some organizational characteristics of projects had a direct effect upon the delivery of Title IV services. These included:

- *Organized planning function.* Did the project have a formal plan? Could it be specific about the activities it had undertaken during the present year? Did it have explicit objectives in offering these activities? Could it delineate a series of schedules or milestones to determine if objectives were being met? Was there a feedback loop to modify plans, goals, objectives, and activities as necessary?
- *Organization management.* Were there explicit descriptions of organizational functions and staff responsibilities within the project? Was there an identification of the organizational chain of command? Did the project appear to have the organizational flexibility to meet different client requirements? How independent was the project from its host institution?
- *Staff capability.* How much training and experience did the staff have in their responsibilities? Did their educational background seem appropriate to the client districts? Had they worked in desegregated environments? Were they in favor of desegregation? Did they seem familiar with the districts they served?
- *Project office operations.* Did the project implement activities as planned? Did it adhere to schedules? Did it coordinate the activities with other agencies?
- *Intraoffice communications and cooperation.* How frequently did staff meet? Who reported to whom? To what extent did staff cooperate and interact? What was the extent of staff involvement in planning, decisionmaking, and project evaluation?

PROJECT OFFICE INTERACTION WITH LEAS/PROCESS VARIABLES

These ratings were considered to be "process variables," the how-to of Title IV training and technical assistance. Although they are dependent on the organizational characteristics described before, they are much more client-centered.

- *Project office flexibility of response.* Was the project willing to adjust procedures and programs to local contingencies? How were local people involved in the planning stage? What was the role of the project staff in identification of needs?
- *Method of access to district pivotal people.* Was the method effective? What techniques were utilized?
- *Depth of local community contacts.* Did project staff contact schools, community groups, school board members, public officials? Are the people contacted by the staff those who have power within the district?
- *Depth of administration contacts.* Did project staff contact the superintendent regularly? How often and how interactive is the contact with other administrators?

PROJECT INTERACTION WITH LEAS/PRODUCT VARIABLES

This set of ratings describes the "product" of Title IV services--their effect upon the client districts served.

- *District policy/programs impact.* Did the project have a specific impact upon district policies or programs?
- *District personnel impact.* Did the project have an impact upon personnel recruitment and selection?
- *Participant impact.* Did the project have an impact upon the way in which participants did their jobs? On their job skills? On their attitudes or perspectives?
- *Impact on community group relationship to district structure.* Did the project lead to more involvement in the local desegregation effort by community groups? Do they now have more open access to the district's decisionmakers?

- *District institutional impact.* Did the project affect the district organizationally? Did it institute new administrative procedures, positions, or functions? Has the decisionmaking process been altered? Have the roles of certain district personnel been altered?

MISCELLANEOUS

These ratings were grouped together because they related neither to organizational aspects, process variables, or impact variables. Instead, they seemed to relate more to the interviewers' perceptions of district environment and project efficacy--a "gestalt" of the effect of the other ratings plus unmeasurable impressions. For this reason, we have referred to these ratings as "global measures."

- *District environment amenable to further desegregation movement.* Did the school board, voters, and superintendent support the execution of a desegregation mandate?
- *Project perceived as positive or negative.* In all, did the interviewer leave the site visit with positive or negative feelings about the project and its progress with its client districts?
- *Project perceived as active or passive.* In general, did the project seem to take an active role in the delivery of desegregation-related services?
- *Project perceived as effective or ineffective.* Overall, did the project appear to be effective?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, H. B., *Rural Reconstruction in Action*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1953.

Allport, Gordon, "The Psychology of Participation," in G. Allport, *Personality and Social Encounter*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1960.

Arensberg, Conrad, and Arthur H. Niehoff, *Introducing Social Change: A Manual for Americans Overseas*, Aldine, Chicago, 1964.

Argyris, Chris, *Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness*, Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois, 1962.

Bennis, Warren G., and Edgar H. Schein, "Principles and Strategies in the Use of Laboratory Training to Improve Social Systems," in W. G. Bennis, K. Benne, and R. Chin (eds.), *The Planning of Change* (2d ed.), Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1969.

Bennis, Warren G., Kenneth Benne, and Robert Chin (eds.), *The Planning of Change* (2d ed.), Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1969.

Berman, P., et al., *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV (Abridged): A Summary of the Findings in Review*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/4-HEW (Abr.), April 1975.

Berman, P., et al., *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. V: Executive Summary*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/5-HEW, April 1975.

Berman, P., and M. W. McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. I: A Model of Educational Change*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/1-HEW, September 1974.

Berman, P., and M. W. McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV: The Findings in Review*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/4-HEW, April 1975.

Berman, P., and E. W. Pauly, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. II: Factors Affecting Change Agent Projects*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/2-HEW, April 1975.

Blansfield, M. G., "Depth Analysis of Organizational Life," *California Management Review*, Winter 1959, pp. 29-42.

Clark, David L., and Egon G. Guba, *Innovation in School Curricula*, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Crain, Robert L., et al., *The Politics of School Desegregation*, Aldine, New York, 1968.

Goodlad, John I., *Desegregating the Integrated School*, Clearinghouse Publications, No. 9, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., October 1967.

Greenwood, P. W., et al., *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/3-HEW, April 1975.

Hampden-Turner, Charles, *Radical Man*, Doubleday-Anchor, New York, 1971.

Harrison, Roger, and Richard Hopkins, "The Design of Cross-Cultural Training: An Alternative to the University Model," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1967, pp. 431-460; also in W. G. Bennis, K. Benne, and R. Chin (eds.), *The Planning of Change* (2d ed.), Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1969.

Havelock, Ronald G., *The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education*, Educational Technology Publications, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973.

Havelock, Ronald G., *Planning for Innovation*, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1969.

Havelock, Ronald G., and Mary C. Havelock, *Training for Change Agents: A Guide to the Design of Training Programs in Education and Other Fields*, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1973.

Hirschman, Albert, *Development Project Observed*, Brookings, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Katz, Irwin, "Factors Influencing Negro Performance in the Desegregated School," in J. Deutsch, I. Katz, and A. Jensen (eds.), *Social Class, Race and Psychological Development*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1968, pp. 254-292.

Katz, Irwin, "Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools?," *Integrated Education*, Issue 30, Vol. 5, No. 6, December 1967-January 1968, pp. 15-27.

Kelman, Herbert C., "Manipulation of Human Behavior, An Ethical Dilemma for the Social Scientist," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1965, pp. 31-46; also in W. G. Bennis, K. Benne, and R. Chin (eds.), *The Planning of Change* (2d ed.), Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1969.

Key, V. O., Jr., *The Administration of Federal Grants to the States*, Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1937.

Kirby, David, Robert Crain, and T. Robert Harris, *Political Strategies in Northern School Desegregation*, D. C. Heath, New York, 1973.

Lippitt, R., J. Watson, and B. Westley, *The Dynamics of Planned Change*, Harcourt, Brace, and Co., New York, 1958.

Lucas, William A., *The Case Survey Method: Aggregating Case Experience*, The Rand Corporation, R-1515-RC, October 1974.

Mann, D., et al., *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change.* Appendix A. *Innovations in Classroom Organization and Staff Development*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/3-HEW (App. A), April 1975.

McConnell, Grant, *Private Power and American Democracy*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1969.

McLaughlin, M., and P. Berman, *Macro and Micro Implementation*, The Rand Corporation, P-5431, May 1975.

Morris, Peter, and Morton Rein, *Dilemmas of Social Reform*, Atherton Press, New York, 1969.

Orfield, Gary, *The Reconstruction of Southern Education*, Wiley, New York, 1969.

Pascal, A. H., et al., *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change.* Appendix D. *Innovations in Career Education*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/3-HEW (App. D), April 1975.

Pettigrew, Thomas F., *Racially Separate or Together?*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971.

Rein, Martin, *Social Policy: Issues of Choice and Change*, Random House, New York, 1970.

St. John, Nancy, "Social-Psychological Aspects of School Desegregation," in P. Walberg and L. Kopan (eds.), *Rethinking Urban Education*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1972.

Schon, Donald A., *Beyond the Stable State*, Random House, New York, 1971.

Seashore, C., and E. Van Egmond, "The Consultant-Trainer Role in Working Directly with a Total Staff," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 15, 1959, pp. 36-52.

Smith, Al, et al., *Achieving Effective Desegregation*, Real Estate Research Corporation, D. C. Heath, Lexington, Massachusetts, 1973.

Sperling, Jan Bodo, *The Human Dimension of Technical Assistance*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1968.

Stockman, David A., "The Social Pork Barrel," *The Public Interest*, No. 39, Spring 1975, pp. 3-30.

Sumner, G. C., et al., *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change.* Appendix C. *Innovations in Bilingual Education*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/3-HEW (App. C), April 1975.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *School Desegregation in Ten Communities*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., June 1973.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Title IV and School Desegregation: A Study of a Neglected Federal Program*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., January 1973.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Report on Title IV: 1965-1972*, Office of Education, Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity, December 1973.

Wholey, Joseph, et al., *Title I Evaluation and Technical Assistance*, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., February 1971.

Wirt, J. G., et al., *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change.* Appendix B. *Innovations in Reading*, The Rand Corporation, R-1589/3-HEW (App. B), April 1975.

Wirt, F., and M. Kirst, *The Political Web of American Schools*, Little, Brown, and Co., Boston, 1972.